











LONDON  
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.,  
NEW-STREET SQUARE

THE  
EDINBURGH REVIEW,

OR  
*CRITICAL JOURNAL:*

FOR  
JULY, 1863. . . . . OCTOBER, 1863.

*TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.*

---

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR,  
PUBLIUS SYRUS.

---

VOL. CXVIII.

LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS, AND GREEN, LONDON;  
ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK,  
EDINBURGH.

---

1863.

OS 2 E DI

Vol. 118 (Pt 1 + 2)

**Uttarpara Jai Krishna Public Library**

**Acce No.** 7478 **Date** 22 7 75.

## CONTENTS OF No. 241.

---

	Page
ART. I.—1. Memorials and Letters illustrative of the Life and Times of John Graham, of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee. By Mark Napier. 3 vols. 8vo. Edinburgh: 1859–62.	
2. The Case for the Crown <i>in re</i> the Wigton Martyrs proved to be Myths <i>versus</i> Wodrow and Lord Macaulay, Patrick the Pedler and Principal Tulloch. By Mark Napier. Edinburgh: 1863, . . . . .	1
II.—1. The Druids Illustrated. By the Rev. John B. Pratt, M.A. Edinburgh: 1861.	
2. Brut y Tywysogion, or the Chronicle of the Princes. Edited by the Rev. John Williams ab Ithel, M.A. Published by the authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. London: 1860.	
3. The Celtic Druids; or an Attempt to show that the Druids were the Priests of Oriental Colonies who emigrated from India, and were the Introducers of the First or Cadmeian System of Letters and the Builders of Stonehenge, Carnac, and other Cyclopean Works in Asia and Europe. By Godfrey Higgins, Esq. 4to. London: 1829, . . . . .	40
III.—History of the Modern Styles of Architecture: being a Sequel to the Handbook of Architecture. By James Fergusson, Fellow of the Royal Institute of British Architects. London: 1862, . . . . .	71
IV.—1. Histoire de la Révolution Française. Par M. Louis Blanc. 12 vols. Paris: 1847–62.	
2. Histoire de la Terreur, 1792–4, d'après des documents authentiques et inédits. Par M. Mortimer-Ternaux, 2 vols. Paris: 1862, . . . . .	101
V.—A Dialogue on the Best Form of Government. By the Right Honourable Sir George Cornewall Lewis, Bart., M.P. London: 1863, . . . . .	138
VI.—1. Les Marines de la France et de l'Angleterre. Par M. Xavier Raymond. Paris: 1863.	

# CONTENTS.

	Page
2. Iron-clad sea-going Shield Ships. A Lecture delivered on the 25th March, 1863, at the Royal United Service Institution, by Captain Cowper Phipps Coles, R.N. London, . . . . .	166
VII.—1. Memoirs communicated to the Royal Geographical Society, June 22nd, 1863. By Captain Speke.	
2. Anniversary Address, May 25th, 1863. By Sir Roderick Impey Murchison, K.C.B., President of the Royal Geographical Society.	
3. Papers communicated to the Ethnological Society, June 30th, 1863. By Captain Augustus Grant, . . . . .	207
VIII.—1. Les Écossais en France, les Français en Écosse. Par Francisque-Michel. 2 vols. 8vo. Londres: 1862.	
2. Papiers d'État relatifs à l'Histoire de l'Écosse au 16 <sup>m</sup> Siècle; tirés des Bibliothèques et des Archives de France, et publiés pour le Bannatyne Club d'Edimbourg. 3 vols. 4to. Paris.	
3. Papers relative to the Royal Guard of Scottish Archers in France. (From Original Documents.) Printed at Edinburgh for the Maitland Club. 1 vol. 4to. 1835, . . . . .	230
IX.—1. The Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man, with Remarks on Theories of the Origin of Species by Variation. By Sir Charles Lyell, F.R.S., &c. 8vo. 1863.	
2. Antiquités Celtiques et Antédiluviennes. Par M. Boucher de Perthes. 8vo. Paris. Vol. I. 1847. Vol. II. 1857.	
3. Machoire humaine découverte à Abbeville dans un terrain non rémanié; Note de M. Boucher de Perthes, présentée par M. de Quatrefages (Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences). 20 Avril, 1863.	
4. Note sur l'authenticité de la découverte d'une machoire humaine et de hâches de silex dans le terrain diluvien de Moulin Quignon. Par M. Milne-Edwards (Comptes Rendus, 18 Mai 1863).	
5. On the Occurrence of Flint Implements, associated with the Remains of Animals of Extinct Species, &c. By Joseph Prestwich, Esq., F.R.S. (Philosophical Transactions, 1860.)	
6. Prehistoric Man, Researches into the Origin of Civilization in the Old and New World. By Daniel Wilson, LL.D. 8vo. 2 vols. 1862, . . . . .	254

## CONTENTS OF No. 242.

	Page
ART. I.—1. Queensland—a highly eligible Field for Emigration, and the future Cotton-field of Great Britain. By John Dunmore Lang, D.D., Representative of the City of Sydney in the Parliament of New South Wales. London: 1861.	
2. Pugh's Queensland Almanac, Directory, and Law Calendar for 1863. Brisbane: 1862.	
3. Statistical Register of Queensland for the years 1860–61–62. Compiled in the Office of the Registrar-General. Brisbane: 1861–62–63, .	305
II.—Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter, vom fünften Jahrhundert bis zum sechzehnten Jahrhundert. Von Ferdinand Gregorovius. Vols. I.—IV. Stuttgart: 1859—1862, . . . . .	342
III.—1. Account of the Principal Triangulation of Great Britain. London: 1858.	
2. Extension of the Triangulation of the Ordnance Survey into France and Belgium. By Colonel Sir Henry James, R.E. F.R.S. London: 1862.	
3. An Account of the Operations carried on for Accomplishing a Trigonometrical Survey of England and Wales; from the Commencement, in the Year 1784, to the End of the Year 1794. By Captain William Mudge and Mr. Isaac Dalby. London: 1799.	
4. Report of the Select Committee on the Cadastral Survey, ordered by the House of Commons to be printed. 1862. . . . .	378
IV.—The Life of Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke, Secretary of State in the Reign of Queen Anne. By Thomas Macknight. London: 1863, . . . . .	404
V.—1. Lectures on Jurisprudence; being the Sequel to 'The Province of Jurisprudence Determined.' To which are added Notes and Fragments, now first published from the Original Manuscripts. By the late John Austin, Esq., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Two vols. 8vo. London: 1863.	
2. On the Uses of the Study of Jurisprudence. By the late John Austin, Esq., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Reprinted from the Third Volume of 'Lectures on Jurisprudence.' London: 1863, . . . . .	439
VI.—1. The History of the Royal Academy of Arts from its Foundation in 1768 to the Present Time, with	



	Page
Biographical Notices of all its Members. By William Sandby. In two volumes. London: 1862.	
2. Report from the Council of the Royal Academy to the General Assembly of Academicians. 1860.	
3. Report of the Royal Commission appointed to enquire into the Present Position of the Royal Academy in relation to the Fine Arts, together with Minutes of Evidence, &c. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty. 1863, .	483
VII.—1. Travels in Peru and India, while superintending the Collection of Chinchona Plants and Seeds in South America, and their Introduction into India. By Clements R. Markham, F.S.A., F.R.G.S. 1862.	
2. Notes on the Propagation and Cultivation of the Medical Chinchonas or Peruvian Bark Trees. (Printed and published by order of the Government of Madras.) By William Graham M'Ivor. Madras: 1863.	
3. Two Letters from W. G. M'Ivor, Esq., to J. D. Sim, Esq., Secretary to Government. Madras: 1863.	
4. Report on the Bark and Leaves of Chinchona Succiruba, grown in India. By J. E. Howard, Esq. 1863.	
5. Memorandum on the Indigenous Cotton Plant of the Coast of Peru, and on the Proposed Introduction of its Cultivation into India. By Clements R. Markham, Esq. 1862.	6
6. Memorandum by Dr. Wight on the Introduction of the Cotton Plants of the Peruvian Coast Valleys into the Madras Presidency. 1863, . . . . .	507
VIII.—History of England during the Reign of George the Third. By John George Phillimore. London: 1863, . . . . .	523
IX.—Tara: A Mahratta Tale. By Captain Meadows Taylor. Author of 'The Confessions of a Thug.' 3 vols. Edinburgh: 1863, . . . . .	542
X.—1. Report of the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. 1863.	
2. Documents relative to the Erection and Endowment of additional Bishoprics in the Colonies, with an Historical Preface. By the Rev. Ernest Hawkins. Fourth Edition. 1855.	
3. Judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on the Appeal of the Rev. W. Long v. the Right Rev. Robert Gray, D.D., Bishop of Cape Town, from the Supreme Court of the Cape of Good Hope. 1863, . . . . .	552

THE  
EDINBURGH REVIEW,

JULY, 1863.

---

N<sup>o</sup>. CCXLI.

---

- ART. I. — 1. *Memorials and Letters illustrative of the Life and Times of John Graham, of Claverhouse, Viscount Dundee.* By MARK NAPIER. 3 vols. 8vo. Edinburgh: 1859–62.
2. *The Case for the Crown in re the Wigton Martyrs proved to be Myths versus Wodrow and Lord Macaulay, Patrick the Pedler and Principal Tulloch.* By MARK NAPIER. Edinburgh: 1863.

THE first volume of the ‘*Memorials of the Viscount Dundee*’ was given to the public three years ago; and as the two concluding volumes have appeared more recently, we have now the work before us as a whole, and are able to judge fairly of its merits. It is confessedly designed as a sequel to the author’s ‘*Life and Times of Montrose*,’ a compilation of a Protean kind, which appeared at different times under four different titles and as many different sizes, reminding us, by the ingenuity with which the same materials were made to assume a great variety of shapes, of the transformations of the kaleidoscope. The two works embrace the fifty troublous years stretching from 1640 to 1690, and they are designed not merely to clear the fame of the two Scotch Royalist leaders from the mists of prejudice and passion, but to throw a new light upon the history of events in Scotland prior to the Revolution. According to Mr. Napier, all previous histories of these times have been written wrong: Charles I. was a saintly martyr, Charles II. a perfect gentleman, James II. a good-natured, kindly man; and the Covenanters, who were hunted, hanged, drawn, and quartered, got

only what they deserved. These opinions, conspicuous enough in the *Life of Montrose*, are stated with double energy in the *Memorials of Dundee*; and Mr. Napier, as we shall presently see, is at all times peculiarly energetic in his manner of speaking, excelling almost all living authors in his rich vocabulary of complimentary epithets.

As Mr. Napier differs from all previous historians of these times regarding historic truth, so does he differ from all previous bookmakers in the art of making his book. He is eminently original in his manner as well as his matter. Order and arrangement he has evidently regarded as beneath the notice of a man who has brought forth old documents from charter chests, and published them for the first time to the world. His volumes are a chaos, without form and void. We can trace no plan in them; and, in the midst of the confusion with which he envelopes us, it is only at distant intervals we can get a hold of the thread of his narrative. More than half of the first volume is devoted to lavish abuse of Wodrow, Lord Macaulay, and even Sir Walter Scott, which he speaks of as clearing the way for the advent of his hero in unclouded glory; and when at last the history is begun, it is so often interrupted that the author may indulge his peculiar instincts, that it seems like a slender stream of water slowly finding its way through waste land, and constantly hid from view by the useless sedges and thickets which grow upon its brink. He has no dread of redundancy or repetition. He will print the same letter three times at full length, and tell the same story half a dozen times, and allude to it again as many times more. It is thus that a life containing very few memorable incidents is swollen out into three volumes; and it requires a patience that will flag without hope of reward to read through them all. If we might venture to compare his method, or rather want of it, with that of any one else, it would be with Wodrow's, a writer whom he cordially hates, but whom he has nevertheless carefully studied; and in doing so may have become infected with his faults, as a man may catch contagion from an enemy.

But Mr. Napier has high pretensions as a historian. He is no retailer of other men's goods,—no parrot repeating other men's tales,—no vendor of old fables, embellished and fitted for the modern market by a tinsel eloquence. He has dug for himself into the depths of antiquity, and disclosed its treasures. He has ransacked the archives of noble families, where no meaner scribe would be allowed to enter, and brought hidden things to light. Forty letters of Claverhouse has he rescued from oblivion, and from these, it is his proud boast, posterity will

be able to judge of that hero by a truer test than what he calls, in a striking alliterative climax, 'the fanaticism of a Wodrow, 'the fancy of a Scott, or the ferocity of a Macaulay!' Nor let us be so unjust as to deny to Mr. Napier the merit of research, although it will appear before we have done with him that he has prodigiously overrated his own achievements. It is certain he has no lack of zeal for the cause to which he has devoted himself. He evidently feels that he is engaged in a religious work. He evidently believes that he has a great mission to perform in setting the world right by showing that the bloody Claverhouse of tradition was the most humane of men, and that the Cameronians, whom he hunted on the hills, were 'Thugs,' 'assassins,' 'ruffians,' and 'wild cats.' He believes in his paradox, as thoroughly as the Covenanters believed in their covenant; and we suppose that, like them, he would cheerfully die for it.

The first portion of the *Memorials of Dundee* is taken from an unfinished MS., left by the late Mr. Charles Kirkpatrick Sharpe. This Mr. Sharpe was an Edinburgh celebrity in his day. He was a friend of Sir Walter Scott; fond of antiquarian research; possessed of some wit; an ardent high-churchman and Tory, and regarded with proud disdain all Presbyterians and Whigs. Scott spoke of him, in complimentary fashion, as the Horace Walpole of Scotland. He took a curious way of showing his contempt for the Covenanters; he carefully edited and published two high-flying covenanting manuscripts. The first was 'Kirkton's Secret and True History of the Church of Scotland;' and the other was 'Law's Memorials of Memorable Things.' The text of these devout believers in Presbytery and the Covenant he illustrated by notes of his own; and it is amusing, though not edifying, to read the sneers of the editor at what he conceives to be the fanaticism of his author. The notes often display much out-of-the-way reading, but they are always designed to cast discredit on the historian, or to exhibit in a ridiculous light the heroes of the history. For scandalous stories he had an especial affection; and every piece of filthy gossip retailed by the pamphleteers and libellers of the time in regard to the preachers and leading nobles of the kirk, he has piously preserved for the instruction of the readers of Kirkton and Law. Such a man was quite after Mr. Napier's own heart; and as he had begun a *Life of Claverhouse*, but died, leaving it in an unfinished state, the MS. is now printed and made to form the first part of the *Memorials of Dundee*. Having thus seen something regarding the composition of the book, we must now hasten on to examine its contents.

John Graham, the subject of the '*Memorials*,' was born in the

year 1643. According to the Scotch fashion, he was usually called by the name of his paternal property of 'Claverhouse,' in Forfarshire, a designation which was sometimes abbreviated into Clavers. In 1665 he matriculated at St. Leonard's College, St. Andrew's, where he probably picked up a little learning, but which he never afterwards turned to account. Sir Walter Scott, in criticising one of his letters, remarked that he spelled like a washerwoman; and others have caught up and echoed the pointed expression. But the truth is, the rules of spelling were not fixed in Scotland in his time, and Claverhouse spelled neither better nor worse than his contemporaries. After finishing his university education, which appears to have been at an age much riper than was or is usual in Scotland, he repaired to France and served as a volunteer under the banners of the 'grand monarque.' France was the land to which Scotch military adventurers had from time immemorial resorted to seek for glory and pay; but in Germany and Holland a new field for enterprise had been recently opened up. William, Prince of Orange and Stadtholder of Holland, was at the head of the Dutch armies, and the young Scotchman probably thought that by his patronage he might obtain more rapid promotion than he could in Catholic France, no longer the ally of his native country. For this, or some other reason, he changed sides, passed from France into Holland, and managed to secure the place of a cornet in one of William's own troops of horse-guards. The battle of Seneff was fought two years afterwards, and there is a story,—though not very well authenticated,—that during the changing fortunes of that eventful day, the cornet was the means of saving the Prince's liberty, if not his life. His charger had floundered in a bog, and in a few minutes more he would have been surrounded by the French cavalry, when Graham dismounted and brought him off on his own horse. Mr. Napier groans deeply over this incident in the opening career of his hero; for, had he only left the Dutch Stadtholder to perish in his marsh, there had been no revolution,—no claim of right to secure our liberties,—and we should still have been living under the benign sway of the Stuarts. 'This 'brave action,' says the biographer, 'was performed in an evil 'hour for himself and his native monarchs. Had it not been for 'his luckless aid, the persecutor of his family, the evil genius of 'the unfortunate James, the fiend of Glencoe, might have sunk 'innocuous and comparatively unknown in the depths of a 'Batavian marsh.' The cornet, as the story goes, received the command of a troop of horse for his gallantry; but, presuming on the obligation under which he had laid the Prince, he shortly

afterwards solicited a regiment which had become vacant. The Prince pleaded a previous promise as an excuse for declining to grant the request; but our ambitious cavalier thought himself slighted, and left the service in disgust, which, of course, gives occasion to his biographer to declaim against Dutch ingratitude. In 1676, or 1677, he returned to his native country to seek for employment there. Let us glance at the state of Scotland at the period of his return.

Scotland had never renounced, as England had, its allegiance to the Stuarts. On the death of Charles I. it proclaimed Charles II., and paid for its loyalty by the disastrous defeats of Dunbar and Worcester. At the Restoration the rejoicings were as universal as they were insane. A day of thanksgiving was proclaimed, sermons were preached, barrels of ale and wine bronched; and in rude fire-works Oliver Cromwell was seen pursued by the devil, to the immense delight of the people. The new monarch wrote a letter to the Presbytery of Edinburgh promising to protect the Church established by law. The Presbytery enclosed the precious document in a silver shrine. The Earl of Lauderdale, who was known to have the royal confidence, wrote to an eminent minister, named Douglas, assuring him that no alteration was designed in the government of the Church, and that at the King's request he had already drawn up a proclamation for the calling of a General Assembly. It had been well if the King had kept by his pledged word, for if he had done so he would have preserved for ever the hearts of his Scottish subjects. And Presbytery now was different from what it had been twenty years before, when the Assembly domineered over the Parliament, insulted the King, and sent an army over the border to extirpate prelacy and sectarianism, according to the solemn league and covenant. The frenzy of these high-handed days was gone. The fever had consumed its own strength; moderation of sentiment had returned; and had the Presbyterian clergy been preserved and fostered by the King's breath, if they did not become obsequious they would at least have been loyal.

But there were soon indications that this was not the policy of the Government. So soon as the monarch felt himself firmly seated on the English throne, he knew he might do with Scotland as he pleased, and in his heart he had no liking for Presbytery. The Marquis of Argyle and James Guthrie, an able but a somewhat violent Presbyterian minister, were sent to the scaffold, for causes which would have consigned the advocates who conducted their prosecution, the jury who tried them, the judges who condemned them, and indeed one half of the

whole kingdom, to the same fate. The Parliament passed the famous Recissory Act, and thus destroyed by one stroke of the pen the whole legislation of the last twenty years. That period was to be a blank in the history of the country — a desolation and a warning. This was followed by the restoration of Episcopacy — a thing as hateful as Popery to the covenanted Scotchman of two centuries ago. Still the nation was weary of contention and longed for peace, and had a particle of moderation or common sense guided the counsels of the King, the change might have been effected without the State being convulsed. But it was resolved to make the ministers who had been inducted into their parishes during the Commonwealth, feel the yoke. They were required to seek presentation from the patrons, and institution from the bishops, under pain of the forfeiture of their benefices. They hesitated to comply with what seemed to them not only a personal humiliation but an open abandonment of their most cherished principles; and in consequence of this three hundred of them were driven from their manse, their livings, and their parishes. The whole west of Scotland had scarcely a single minister left. The Royal Commissioner, the Primate, and the Privy Council were themselves aghast at the ruin they had wrought.

It was not so easy to supply the vacancies which had been made. Bishop Burnet says that a hue and cry went out over all the country for ministers; but at a period when the educated class was comparatively small, qualified ministers could not easily be found; and in the hurry of filling so many pulpits, many men of low origin and no literature, and some of grossly immoral life, got access to the church. Few of them were distinguished for their piety or accomplishments, and the people contemptuously called them the bishops' curates. The seed was already sown which was to spring up and bear such bitter fruit. The deed was done which was to deliver Scotland to the horrors of persecution and civil war. The people could not desert in their day of need the pastors whom they loved, and devoutly wait upon the ministrations of men who had unjustly supplanted them, and were in their eyes the representatives of the black prelacy which they had solemnly abjured in their covenant with God, as an accursed thing. The ousted ministers secretly came into their parishes and held religious meetings in any convenient place they could procure — in a kitchen, a barn, or the hall of a gentleman's house. When no such place could be procured, they met on the hill-side. The people flocked in crowds to hear them; they brought their children to them to be baptised; they received from them the sacrament of the Holy

Supper. The parish churches were deserted. This was the origin of the series of legislative Acts against conventicles, increasing in severity till it was made death to be present at one.

One should think it would be difficult even to apologise for such barbarous legislation, but Mr. Napier is not abashed. He is ready to defend even greater horrors than this. It was, he says, a mere piece of legislative threatening—never meant to be carried into execution—a *brutum fulmen*. It is strange to hear of the Parliament being in sport, erecting bugbears to frighten the people, passing Acts which they never intended to execute; but it seems stranger still when we read these Acts by the light of the times,—when we read of the hundreds who were fined, imprisoned, outlawed, banished for contravening them, till at last they were fairly goaded into rebellion, and then the hangman came and did his office. It were insulting to the character of the Scotch to suppose that they could be thus oppressed and trampled on without being indignant. Their first outbreak against their oppressors took its rise in Galloway, from pity for a poor man who was being maltreated by some soldiers for not paying his church fines, and resulted in the rout and slaughter of the Pentland Hills. Upwards of thirty executions followed the fight, striking terror and dismay into every district of Scotland.

Such was the state of matters when Claverhouse returned from the wars to his native country. His country might be said to be in profound peace. No foreign foe was upon her borders. No schemes of conquest were revolved: but conventicles were increasing. The Presbyterian population persisted in loving their Presbyterian pastors, and wherever they preached they flocked to hear them. The flagitious Government of Lauderdale, a renegade from Presbytery and the Covenant, attempted to make the gentry responsible for their tenants, and, failing to manage this, let loose upon the western shires, where the Presbyterian spirit was strongest, a horde of wild caterans from the highland hills. These, settling upon the richest districts of the country like a flight of locusts, left a wilderness where there was a garden. The barbarous experiment failed; hundreds were ruined; but conventicles were not put down, and another plan was resolved upon. Several troops of horse were raised, to be constantly employed in scouring the southern and western counties, levying fines, seizing outlaws, and above all in suppressing conventicles. Claverhouse managed to get the command of one of these troops, and now at last we find him in the field of his fame.



We can partly trace his progress and see his heroic achievements in some of his letters to the commander-in-chief, which have been preserved. 'On Tuesday was eight days, and Sunday,' he writes, in December, 1678, 'there were great field conventicles just by here, with great contempt of the regular clergy, who complain extremely when I tell them I have no orders to apprehend anybody for past misdemeanours.' In his next letter he narrates at length the great feat of having demolished a barn which had served for a meeting-house. In February following, he is happy to be able to report that he had seized a number of prisoners. His notice of one is illustrative of the man and the times. 'The third brigadier I sent to seek the *wobster*. He brought in his brother for him. Though he, may be, cannot preach as his brother, I doubt not but he is as well principled as he, therefore I thought it would be no great fault to give him the trouble to go with the rest.' The next day he writes, 'Mr. Welsh and others preach securely within twenty or thirty miles off, but we can do nothing for want of spies.' Shortly afterwards he reports that he had seized several persons suspected of attending the conventicles, and then adds, to account for his failure in capturing yet others among whom was a lady, 'There is almost nobody lays in their bed that knows themselves anyways guilty, within forty miles of us; and within a few days I shall be upon them three score of miles off, at one bout, for seizing on the others contained in the order.' Such was the commencement of the first campaign of this great cavalier of the Jacobites; but this was child's play compared with what was to follow.

As Claverhouse and his troops were specially commissioned and employed to put down conventicles, Mr. Napier thinks it necessary to say all he can in condemnation of these. He has devoted a long chapter to the subject, but, notwithstanding the great prolixity and virulence of his abuse, it is very difficult to understand what he would have us to believe. He says the Government required the people of Scotland to frequent the parish church, not in testimony of their faith, but as a proof of their peaceable disposition and submission to the law of the land; and hence obstinately to refuse to conform became a state crime, deserving the severest penalties. If we are not mistaken, Mr. Napier is himself a dissenter from the church established by law in his country—in fact an obstinate Nonconformist. Is this any reason why he should be regarded as wanting in submission to the law, and so fined, imprisoned, or shot? But in the case of the Presbyterians, he argues, 'it was not an innocent and conscientious Nonconformity.' We apprehend

that simple Nonconformity, if innocent in one case, must be innocent in another; if innocent in an Episcopalian must be innocent in a Presbyterian; and we think it impossible to read the history of those sad times without being convinced that though the Covenanters were fanatical, they were at least conscientious—perhaps only too sternly conscientious. But then they were traitors and firebrands who preached at these meetings—sowers of sedition, stirrers up of rebellion! The men who preached at these meetings were simply the three hundred parish ministers who had been driven from their parishes because they could not bring themselves to seek anew institution from the prelates who had been thrust upon them, and there is no proof whatever that they preached sedition. We may freely allow, however, that they would not preach such loyal doctrines on the hill-side as they would have done in the parish church. But Mr. Napier has the authority of the State proclamations of the time for declaring that these gatherings were the ‘rendezvous of rebellion.’ The only foundation for this widely trumpeted accusation is that after six or seven years of suffering, during which the Presbyterians saw their religious meetings dispersed by ruthless dragoons, their ministers compelled to skulk as outlaws among the hills, their best families ruined by exorbitant fines, hundreds of all classes imprisoned, banished, or hanged, they resolved to meet with arms in their hands to defend themselves in case of a surprise by the troops, which were constantly riding over mountain and moor in search of them. But it was only for defence that they armed themselves, or why seek the loneliest places for their meetings? why have so peaceably dispersed when their worship was done? why have only twice come into serious collision with the military, and that when they were attacked amid the marshes of Drumclog and Airmoss? In truth all Mr. Napier’s reasons against conventicles are as absurd as the concluding one, though not so comical. Such promiscuous meetings, he says, were a great attraction to the sex, more especially as ladies of distinction were placed on high chairs in front of the crowd, which, he gravely observes, were just ‘towering thrones of female turbulence, folly and vanity.’\*

The month of May 1679 was made memorable by the murder of Archbishop Sharp. The act was applauded by the few whom oppression had made mad, but condemned by the great bulk of the Presbyterians, although they regarded the murdered man as the Judas of their church. On Sunday, the first of June, when Claverhouse was as usual scouring the moors in

search of conventicles, he suddenly came upon one, as he himself tells us, 'little to his advantage.' Worn out with his rapid flight from Drumclog, where he was shamefully beaten, the mortified hero sat down that night in Glasgow and wrote to his commander-in-chief how the rogues sent their women and children to the rear, kept the ground manfully with fusils and pitchforks, brought a cornet and captain quickly to the ground and many dragoons and guardsmen besides, ripped up the belly of his own sorrel horse so 'that his guts hung out half an ell; and yet,' says he, 'he carried me off a mile, which so discouraged our men that they sustained not the shock, but fell 'into disorder'—from which it would appear that Graham and his charger fled first, and that the others, beholding this, followed pell-mell. The Battle of Bothwell Bridge rapidly followed. Claverhouse was present at the head of his troop of horse-guards. He took no part in the fight, but endeavoured to wipe out the disgrace of Drumclog by sabering the fugitives, till ordered to desist from the butchery by the gentle Monmouth.

But Bothwell was not over when the fanatical rabble was dispersed and the slaughter stayed. Several large landed proprietors had been present in arms against the Government. Their estates must be confiscated. Four or five thousand men had got safely off from the field; they must be ferreted out in their homes or hiding-places and brought to justice. No better man for such work than Claverhouse could be found; and he was soon in the saddle again hunting down the fugitives from law, who were now almost as plentiful as moorfowl on the western moorlands. But in doing the work of the master whom he served, he did not forget himself. Lord Macaulay has charged him with being *rapacious*. Mr. Napier has vehemently denied it, but in making the denial he has furnished the proof. One of the largest estates confiscated was the barony of Freugh in Galloway. Claverhouse obtained a grant of it from the Crown. He had been long employed in levying fines; and the Lords of the Treasury complained to the King that they had never got any account of them. The King hinted the matter to him, and, like other guilty men, he denied he had a farthing to account for. Not content with what he had already obtained, two years afterwards he writes to Queensberry begging that he 'would speak to the Duke, and represent the thing to the 'Lords of the Treasury that he might have the gift of any that 'were not yet forfeited, that he could find probation against.' A monstrous proposition for a public servant to make—he was to seize upon the estate so soon as he found sufficient proof to

secure its forfeiture! An excellent spur to diligence! an admirable incentive to justice! And Graham was now not only a Captain of Horse, but Sheriff of Dumfries, Kirkcudbright, and Wigton,—the law being joined to the sword, that he might make short work with delinquents. He must have known that the people believed he was growing rich by their plunder, for we find him on one occasion endeavouring to persuade them that though the fines had been doubled, he did not wish 'to enrich himself by their crimes.' But the full price for which he had sold himself to despotism was not yet paid down. On the death of the Duke of Lauderdale, the ruin of his brother and heir was resolved on. He was accused of peculation as General of the Mint; and Claverhouse, forgetting former favours and friendship, and scenting the carrion from afar, was moving heaven and earth for a portion of the Lauderdale estates before any sentence of a court had been pronounced. He ultimately obtained Dudhope, which lay conveniently near his paternal estate, together with some valuable heritable jurisdictions connected with Dundee.

In the charter chest of the ducal house of Buccleugh and Queensberry Mr. Napier found a number of letters addressed by Claverhouse to the Duke of Queensberry, who succeeded to the chief place of power in Scotland after the downfall of Lauderdale. Upon the discovery of these he sets prodigious store. The recovery of the lost decades of Livy were nothing to it. Most of the letters are in truth worthless; they tell us nothing which we did not know before; but as Mr. Napier declares a hundred times that his hero is everywhere misrepresented by that 'low-minded Dominie,' 'brutal calumniator,' and 'idiot' Wodrow, who has been again repeated by the novelist Macaulay, we shall read his doings in 1679 by the light which he has himself let in on them.

'The country hereabouts,' he writes, 'is in great dread. Upon our march yesterday, most men were fled, not knowing against whom we designed. . . . The first thing I mean to do is to fall to work with all that have been in the rebellion, or accessory thereto, by giving men, money or arms; and next, ressetters; and after that, field conventicles.' (Vol. ii. p. 260-1.) 'I can catch nobody, they are all so alarmed.' (P. 263.) 'On Sunday last there was about 300 people at Kirkcudbright Church, some that for seven years had never been seen there, so that I do expect that within a short time I could bring two parts of three to the church. But when I have done, that is all to no purpose; for we will be no sooner gone but in come their ministers, and all repent and fall back to their own ways.' 'Here in the shire I find the lairds all following the example of a late great man, and still a considerable heritor among them

[Lord Stair], which is to live regularly themselves, but have their houses constant haunts of rebels and intercommuned persons, and have their children baptised by the same, and then lay the blame on their wives; condemning them, and swearing they cannot help what is done in their absence. But I am resolved this jest shall pass no longer, as it is laughing and fooling the Government.' (P. 268.) 'I sent out a party with my [*brother Dave?*] three nights ago. The first night he took *Drumbui*, and one Inklellan, and that great villain McClorg, the smith at Minnigaff, that made all the *Clikys*, and after whom the forces have trotted so often. It cost me both pains and money to know how to find him. I am resolved to hang him.' (P. 270.) 'This country now is in perfect peace. All who were in the rebellion are either seized, gone out of the country, or treating their peace; and they have already so conformed, as to going to the church, that it is beyond my expectation. In Dumfries not only almost all the men are come, but the women have given obedience; and Irongray, Welsh's own parish, have for the most part conformed; and so it is over all the country.' (P. 273.) 'We are now come to read lists every Sunday after sermon of men and women, and we find few absent. . . . I have examined every man in the shire, and almost all the Stewartry of Galloway, and fixed such a guilt upon them, that they are absolutely in the King's reverence.'

After this we need not go either to Wodrow or Macaulay to learn the character of Claverhouse, and of the ruthless government which he served. What a melancholy picture do we get a glimpse of in these letters, and only a glimpse; whole districts fleeing from their houses on the approach of the man whose name is yet mentioned in the same places with such deep detestation, husbands resorting to the subterfuge of blaming their wives for having their children baptised by Presbyterian ministers, ultimately the majority of the people dragooned into a sulky attendance at the parish church, and the captain of the troop, at the end of the service, calling the roll and marking the absentees. Even Mr. Napier appears to feel that this was no great work for a hero to do, and that he must have cut a very ridiculous figure in doing it, but he consoles himself with the thought that the covenanted ladies, whom he had marched to church, could not but turn away their eyes from the parson to admire his smart uniform and handsome face! But for his zeal in this work, such as it was, he was made a colonel and a privy councillor, admitted to the confidential friendship of the King and the Duke of York, and enriched out of the wreck of the fortunes of Lauderdale by the house of Dudhope and the constabulary of Dundee.

The author of the *Memorials* frequently speaks of the humanity of his hero, and the following extracts from his letters

are the chief proofs which are produced in support of this newly-discovered feature in his character : —

‘I was going to have sent in the other prisoners ; but amongst them there is one Mr. Francis Irvine, an old and infirm man, who is extremely troubled with the gravel ; so that I will be forced to delay for five or six days.’ (Dumfries, April 21st, 1679.) ‘I hope your Lordship will pardon me that I have not sent in the prisoners that I have here. There is one of them that has been so *tortured with the gravel it was impossible to transport him*. Besides expecting considerable orders, I had no mind to part with thirty or forty horses. And the Sunday’s journey has a little jaded our horses.’ (Dumfries, May 6th, 1679.) ‘We have already,’ says Mr. Napier, ‘afforded a striking illustration of the disposition of bloody Clavers to care for the suffering poor. . . . And this sympathy, being the natural impulse of his disposition, he extended to every rebel prisoner under his charge, “even a Whig,” whose case seemed to require it.’ (Vol. i. p. 138-9.)

Marvellous humanity ! Exquisite sympathy with suffering ! This old infirm minister, a prisoner in the hands of Claverhouse, ‘was so tortured with gravel that it was impossible to transport him’ for some days, and besides, the horses were jaded, and could not be spared ; therefore our captain must have been a man of very fine feelings, caring even for his prisoners, and it may be added, still more for his beasts ! Surely such an old diseased man could not be very dangerous to the Government, but he was nevertheless despatched to Edinburgh, and from Edinburgh sent to the Bass Rock, there to die. The tender mercies of the wicked are cruel !

Among the most amusing things in the letters of Claverhouse are his frequent outbursts of wrath against the Presbyterian ‘wives.’ They were the head and front of the offending, they seduced their husbands, they sheltered the outlaws, they were mad for their ministers, they could hardly be brought to church. But these outbursts are rendered doubly amusing by the fact that the indignant dragoon was at last himself led captive by a covenanted maiden, Lady Jane Cochrane, a daughter of one of the leading Whig and Presbyterian families in the west of Scotland. The mother opposed the union of her daughter with the persecutor of her faith, and the lover thought it necessary to write the Duke of York that ‘neither love nor any other folly’ would seduce him from his loyalty. The marriage took place at Paisley ; and though the bridegroom protested that his bride was ‘well principled,’ his connexion with the family of Donaldson was afterwards made the pretext for excluding him from the Privy Council, as it was thought state secrets might be

wormed out of him by his Presbyterian Delilah. In justice to Claverhouse we can say that there was not the slightest symptoms of relenting after his marriage; no female blandishments could touch his hard heart, and on the very day of his nuptials he was in the saddle in search of a conventicle.

In order to understand some of the events which are to follow, we must glance at the state of Scotland about the year 1684. By fourteen years of cruel persecution the great bulk of the people had begun to exhibit an outward conformity with the bastard episcopacy which the King had determined by fire and sword to thrust upon the country. But there was a remnant whom no fear of torture and death could force into compliance. They were called 'society people,' 'Cameronians,' 'wanderers,' 'wild whigs.' Their principles were those of the Solemn League and Covenant, in their fullest extent, and burned into their souls by the persecutions they had endured. They believed it to be their most sacred duty to extirpate all forms of faith but their own, for theirs alone was divine. Even in their hour of greatest need they never weakly preached toleration, for they regarded toleration as a deadly sin. The King must be a covenanted king; the whole nation must be a covenanted nation. For that they struggled, and for that they were willing to die. After years of oppression such as no people with a particle of spirit could tamely submit to, they published their famous Sanquhar Declaration, in which they solemnly renounced their allegiance to Charles Stuart as a perjured and apostate man. Four years later they published their Apologetic Declaration, in which they made it known that they would no longer allow themselves to be butchered in cold blood, but would visit upon all who took an active part in their persecution the just judgments of God. They had been driven to the wall, and now they stood at bay. About the same time two troopers who were quartered at Swine Abbey, and the curate of Carsphairn, were assassinated in their beds, by whom it was never known, but it was suspected that it was by some of the 'wild whigs;' and it is only surprising that notwithstanding the unparalleled provocation the peasantry of Scotland had received, these three murders, and that of the primate, are the only ones which can be laid to their charge. But the Declarations, emphasised by these murders, created a universal alarm among the officials of the Government, and new severities were resorted to. An oath was framed solemnly abjuring the Apologetic Declaration; the military were empowered to administer it to whomsoever they pleased; and if any refused to take it he was to be shot upon the spot, without further form of trial.

But, it may be said, did not the circumstances warrant the severity? Was not the west of Scotland in a state of chronic rebellion? Were not the principles of these men subversive of all society? In answer to this it is enough to say that the peasantry of Scotland were eminently loyal till they were goaded to rebellion. We do not hesitate to affirm that after all they had endured they were right to turn upon their oppressors. We should have despised them as unworthy of their country and their blood if they had continued to crouch and whine under the iron rod with which they were smitten. It is true their religion was not that of the New Testament; but they were profoundly conscientious, though somewhat gloomy and fanatical; and their very gloom and fanaticism were in a great measure the result of the wild life which they were compelled to lead, and the pitiful sufferings to which they were exposed. They delighted to call themselves 'the suffering remnant of the anti-prelatical anti-Erastian, true Presbyterian Church of Scotland.' Their opinions regarding civil and ecclesiastical Government are undoubtedly ridiculous, but they were not dangerous: this was shown by their conduct before the Restoration and after the Revolution; and all history proves that men of such opinions which they never dream of acting on. The members of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland hold the same opinions still, but the Queen has no more peaceful or amiable subjects.

While things were in the state we have described that several incidents occurred, not worse than many others, but which have been more frequently quoted as stamping perpetual infamy on the Government of James II., who had now ascended the throne. The first was that of John Brown of Priesthill, who was shot by Claverhouse, at his own door and in presence of his child and pregnant wife, for refusing to take the Abjuration Oath; the second, that of the two women who were drowned in the Blednoch for the same crime. If these stories were true — true as they were told — it was felt there could be no apology for such atrocities; and accordingly recent Jacobite scepticism has gone so far as to deny them both, and through this denial not only to throw discredit upon Wodrow and Macaulay who narrate them, but on the whole Scottish martyrology. We shall say very little regarding the first case, as the world is now pretty well wearied of the controversy about John Brown, and as we discussed the case fully in our concluding review of Lord Macaulay's *History of England* (Ed. Rev. No. ccxxxii., Oct. 1861), and showed that the letter published by Mr. Napier did not, notwithstanding all his vapouring,

Wetherburn Public Library

Acqn No.

7478

Date

22.7.75



contradict the narrative which Macaulay had given. In a few sentences we shall simply refresh the memory of our readers, and enable them to have a full-length portrait of the man whom Mr. Napier delights to honour.

Lord Macaulay relates that on May 1st, 1685, Brown 'was cutting turf when he was seized by Claverhouse's dragoons, rapidly examined, convicted of nonconformity, and sentenced to death.' As the troopers, accustomed though they were to scenes of blood, hesitated to carry the sentence into execution before the wife and little one, Claverhouse himself raised a pistol and shot him dead while he was yet in the act of prayer. Such is the story as told by Macaulay; but Professor Aytoun, in a note appended to his '*Lays of the Scottish Cavaliers*,' endeavoured to show that Claverhouse could not possibly be present in the district where this military murder was said to have been committed at the date specified, and therefore that the whole story must be a myth. Many people with whom the wish was father to the thought, were settling into this belief, when Mr. Napier discovered in the Queensberry Charter Chest a letter of Claverhouse, in which, under his own hand, he confessed the murder. This letter, appearing at this time, was as if Claverhouse himself had risen from the dead to proclaim before the world his blood-guiltiness. Nor does Claverhouse's own account of the murder essentially differ from that of Wodrow or Macaulay, though of course he softens some of its features, and says nothing about the pitiful accompaniments of wife and child, or of his having been his own executioner. To the Lord Treasurer Queensberry he writes that he had pursued a long way over the hill-mosses two unarmed men, and in the end had seized them. The elder, called John Brown, refused to take the Abjuration Oath, declined to swear that he would never rise in arms against the King, but said he knew no king. His house (to which he had been dragged), being searched, there were found some bullets and matches in it, and also some treasonable papers; but what these papers were we are not told, and most probably they were a copy of the Covenant or of the Westminster Confession. 'Upon which,' says Claverhouse, 'I caused shoot him dead.' The younger man, a nephew of Brown's, agreed to take the oath, but would not swear he had not been at Newmills, where some prisoners had recently been rescued from the military; and accordingly Claverhouse told him also to say his prayers and prepare for death. When the carabincs were presented at his breast, he was told that if he would make an ingenuous confession his life might be spared. The poor youth, with death before his eyes, yielded to his fears, and

declared that his uncle had been at Bothwell, and he himself at the rescue at Newmills. Such is Graham's own official account of this bloody affair, and we appeal to any unprejudiced reader if his version of the story is not quite as revolting as that of Wodrow or Macaulay. For no crime but refusing to take the Abjuration Oath he blew out the brains of the poor man at his own door, and was on the eve of murdering his nephew too; and yet there are people enjoying the liberties which these men bought with their blood, who talk of this Claverhouse as a hero!

We turn now to the case of the Wigton martyrs, and we shall examine it with some minuteness, as Mr. Napier has followed up his '*Memorials*' by a fiercely controversial pamphlet on this matter, and as his assertion that this martyrdom is as legendary as that of St. Ursula and her 11,000 virgins, has been the cause of much premature Jacobite jubilation. The story as told by contemporary writers, and stripped of the concretions which have grown upon it, as upon every tale of the kind, is shortly this:— In the year 1685, known in Scotland as the 'killing time,' an aged widow, named Lauchlison or M'Lauchlane, and a young girl named Wilson, were tried for nonconformity and refusing to take the Abjuration Oath, and condemned to be drowned, and they were drowned accordingly, tied to stakes fixed in the sand of the river Blednoch, where the tide of the Solway overflowed. It is admitted on all hands that they were tried and condemned, but it is now, after the lapse of nearly two centuries, maintained that they were pardoned, and not drowned. In order to understand the argument upon this simple issue we must trace the story from its beginning.

On March 27th, 1685, a royal commission was issued by the Privy Council, appointing Colonel Douglas to be the King's justice in all the southern and western shires, and associating with him as assistant commissioners, Viscount Kenmure, Grier-son of Lagg; Dunbar of Baldoon; M'Culloch of Mircton; and David Graham, Claverhouse's brother and substitute as sheriff of Galloway. The most ample judicial powers were conferred upon the commission; they might try persons for any crime connected with nonconformity, and inflict upon them any punishment known to the law; and, according to the law at this time, to attend a conventicle was a crime to be punished by death. This commission was 'to endure in full force until 'the 20th day of April next, unless the same be further prolonged or recalled.' Among the instructions given to Colonel Douglas for the proper exercise of his justiciary powers, we find the following:—

'If any person own the principles [of the "Cameronians," or "wild whigs," who had published the Apologetic Declaration], or do not disown them, they must be judged at least by three. And you must immediately give them a libel, and the names of the inquest and witnesses, and they being found guilty, are to be hanged immediately in the place according to law. But at this time you are not to examine any women, but such as have been active in the said courses in a signal manner, and these are to be drowned.'

Mr. Napier is loud in his laudation of this instruction as showing the extremely humane maxims by which the Government of James II. was actuated, more especially towards the gentler sex. While the men who had scruples of conscience about taking the oaths which the Government had framed were to be hanged 'according to law,' that is, as he is careful to explain to us, were to be hanged, drawn and quartered; the women who were troubled with the like scruples, were merely to be drowned—a decent and agreeable kind of death (vol. iii. p. 450-1.; vol. ii. 59, 60.) to which none but the most unreasonable would object! Moreover, according to the instructions, only those women who had been active in their wicked courses, and that in a signal manner, were to be dismissed from the world in this pleasing manner,—upon which legal text we have the historical commentary that the two victims were a widow of seventy years of age, and a girl of eighteen.

Before this royal commission, so constituted and instructed, Margaret Lauchlison and Margaret Wilson were brought to trial on the 13th of April, for nonconformity, for not disowning the Apologetical Declaration, and refusing the Oath of Abjuration, and, being found guilty, were condemned to death by drowning, although, as it turned out afterwards, the poor women did not know the nature of the oath, for refusing which they were to die.\* They were now thrown into the gaol of Wigton to await their doom. When there the heroic fortitude which had sustained them at their trial forsook them, or perhaps some humane lawyer managed to persuade them that their scruples were needless, and the Oath of Abjuration was not such

---

\* The records of the Justiciary Court held at Wigton have not been preserved, and we know its procedure only from the petition of Margaret Lauchlison, to be afterwards quoted. In this petition Margaret Lauchlison acknowledges that she was 'justly condemned;' but it must be remembered the petition was written by a 'notary public,' who would employ the form of language ordinarily used in such circumstances; and that very probably the old woman, who 'declared she could not write,' knew very little of the contents of her petition.'

as they had fancied it to be; at all events, they must have felt that life was dear to them, and the fate which awaited them horrible to contemplate, for no Mr. Napier was there to tell them how much more pleasant it was to be drowned than to be hanged. Under some such circumstances as these the elder prisoner petitioned for her life. The petition has been preserved, and is as follows :—

‘Unto his Grace, my Lord High Commissioner, and remanent Lords of his Majesty’s most Honourable Privy Council—The humble supplication of Margaret Lauchlison, now prisoner in the Tolbooth of Wigton. Sheweth : that, whereas I being justly condemned to die by the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty’s most Honourable Privy Council and Justiciary, in a court held at Wigton, the 13th day of April instant, for my not disowning that traitorous Apologetical Declaration lately affixed at several parish churches within this kingdom, and my refusing the Oath of Abjuration of the same, which was occasioned by my not perusing the same; and now I having considered the said Declaration, do acknowledge the same to be traitorous, and tends to nothing but rebellion and sedition, and to be quite contrary unto the written Word of God, and am content to abjure the same with my whole heart. May it therefore please your Grace, and remanent Lords, as said is, to take my case to your serious consideration, being about the age of three score years and ten, and to take pity and compassion on me, and recall the foresaid sentence so justly pronounced against me, and to grant warrant to any your Grace thinks fit to administer the Oath of Abjuration to me, and upon my taking of it, to order my liberation; and your supplicant shall live hereafter a good and faithful subject in time coming, and shall frequent the ordinances, and live regularly, and give what other obedience your Grace and remanent Lords may prescribe thereanent; and your petitioner shall ever pray.’

Such is the petition of Margaret Lauchlison: it is probable that Margaret Wilson, her companion in tribulation, may have petitioned, too; but if so, her petition is not to be found. It will be observed that the petitioner states that she had refused to take the Abjuration Oath because she had never perused it, and was, therefore, ignorant of its contents; and it is a matter of perfect certainty that the Cameronians in general—many of whom were very ignorant and bigoted—regarded the Test and Abjuration Oaths as tantamount to the abjuration of their faith and hopes for eternity. And there was some ground for their scruples. It is not quite plain that the Apologetic Declaration is contrary to the written Word of God, as this poor woman was forced to say that it was. It is not quite clear that men, when crushed by an intolerable tyranny, may not take arms into their hands and right their wrongs. The truth is, the questions generally put to the peasantry were purposely

designed as traps. Do you renounce the Covenant?—do you think the rising at Bothwell was rebellion? If any poor wretch thought that the rising (which ended in the disastrous defeat of Bothwell Bridge) was for Christ's crown and covenant, and therefore not rebellion, he paid for his faith by his life. Everyone remembers the laughable story in 'Old Mortality,' where Cuddy Headriggs saved the life of his old deaf mother by shouting into her ear that it was the 'covenant of works' which the dragoons wished her to renounce, and which she renounced most heartily, to the entire satisfaction of her military examiners, who were not very deeply read in theology. But it must be noted that Margaret Lauchlison had been condemned for nonconformity as well as for refusing the Oath of Abjuration, for her pardon is made to depend upon her promise henceforward 'to frequent the ordinances.'

The petition, which would be regarded as a full recantation, was followed by a reprieve for both the prisoners, dated at Edinburgh on the last day of April. It is as follows:—

'The Lords of His Majesty's Privy Council do hereby reprieve the execution of the sentence of death pronounced by the Justices against Margaret Wilson and Margaret Lauchlison, until the — day of —. And discharge the magistrates of Edinburgh for putting of the said sentence to execution against them until the foresaid day; and recommend the said Margaret Wilson and Margaret Lauchlison to the Lords Secretaries of State, to interpose with his most sacred Majesty for the royal remission to them.'

A great deal of unnecessary fuss has been made about this reprieve as if it had now been discovered for the first time. Wodrow, as Mr. Napier is forced to confess, mentions it and quotes it almost *verbatim*, and every reader of Scotch history was perfectly aware of it, before the author of the *Memorials* arose to instruct him. It is at this point, however, that opinion begins to diverge. Mr. Napier and his followers maintain that the reprieve was tantamount to a pardon, and that the women never were drowned: we shall follow the much more common opinion, and show that the reprieve was not a pardon and was never followed by one, and that the original sentence was carried into execution. Let us see the facts and arguments on the one side and on the other.

Mr. Napier affirms that the reprieve was a virtual pardon; but he does not prove this. No doubt reprieves at that time, as now, were frequently followed by pardons, but certainly not always. In 1688 the celebrated outlawed preacher, James Renwick, was *condemned, reprieved, executed*, just as these women were, for refusing to abjure the Declaration of which he

was the author. He argues that the prisoners must have been removed from Wigton to Edinburgh, as it is the magistrates of Edinburgh and not of Wigton who are discharged from putting the sentence into execution, and that, therefore, they could not afterwards be drowned in the Solway. We cannot admit this conclusion. When the women petition they are still in Wigton gaol, and though it is difficult to understand why the magistrates of Edinburgh should be discharged from putting the sentence into execution, we must expect to meet with difficulties of this kind in regard to events which happened nearly two centuries ago. It is absurd to suppose that everything should be easily explicable. Edinburgh may be a clerical error for Wigton. Or, it is quite possible they may have been taken to Edinburgh when a pardon was expected, and sent back to Wigton to be drowned when a pardon was denied. But it is maintained that there was not time between the 30th of April and the 11th of May to have an answer to the Privy Council's application for mercy to the King. Certainly postal communication was very different then from what it is now; but it was quite possible to have an answer from London within less than the twelve days referred to. The Government, at that period, kept up its communication with Scotland by what were called 'flying packets,' and these travelled from Edinburgh to London in three or four days.\* There is at least one instance of the journey having been performed on horseback, and by the same rider, from metropolis to metropolis in less than three days. The moment Queen Elizabeth expired early on the morning of Thursday, a young courtier jumped into the saddle, and he was in Holyrood Palace late on Saturday night kneeling before James and saluting him King of England, France, and Ireland. After this it must not be pronounced impossible to have had, even then, an answer from London in eleven or twelve days. But though we maintain that this was possible, we think it far more likely that the answer was not waited for, and likeliest of all that the secretaries of state never made the application for a pardon. It is a fact that though many of those who were condemned at this period were undoubtedly spared, only one or two pardons are recorded, from which we may infer that pardons were seldom obtained, and that the reprieved were thus kept in the mercy

---

\* We learn from Rushworth's Collections, that in 1635 the Postmaster of England was commanded 'to settle one running post, or two, to run day and night between Edinburgh and London, to go thither and come back again in six days.'

of the Government to be spared or executed as it afterwards thought fit. As it so happens, however, three condemned men were pardoned in the very year in question, and there is special mention of their pardon in the registers: and as there is no such notice regarding the Wigton martyrs, we may conclude that for them no pardon ever arrived. What more probable than that the women, who in a moment of weakness recanted their principles and begged for their lives, recovered their fortitude and resolved to die rather than renounce what appeared to them equivalent to their hopes of salvation? All martyr-ologies are full of such cases; and it is very certain that if they did so lapse into their covenanting principles, the Government would find a way of having the judicial sentence passed against them carried into execution, notwithstanding the technical difficulties now raised up by legal subtlety. The executive of that day—of which almost every soldier in the service was an arm—did not stick at trifles. Why should they strain at a gnat while they swallowed a camel?

But Mr. Napier has still other grounds for his opinion. Lord Fountainhall, a judge of the Court of Session, he tells us, kept a diary, in which he entered the most interesting events of his day; and yet he never once alludes to this drowning of women in the Solway. The author of the *Memorials* must have been hard pushed for an argument when he resorted to this one. Wigton was at that period so remote from Edinburgh, and communication so imperfect, that it is very possible the Lord of Session may never have heard of the martyrdom. Political murders were not so rare that every one of them was noised over the whole country. Is it maintained that we are to discredit every military and judicial execution but those which Fountainhall has entered in his diary? If so, we must disbelieve one half of those which are proved by evidence beyond suspicion. Fountainhall does not mention John Brown: are we to disbelieve that he was shot, though Claverhouse confesses the murder in his own hand? What would be thought of a man who should refuse to believe that Palmer was executed at Stafford because a gentleman living in Edinburgh had not entered the event in his diary?

But Mr. Napier has another negative witness—Sir George Mackenzie, of Rosehaugh, the Lord Advocate of Scotland at the time the execution is said to have taken place. In his '*Vindication of the Government in Scotland, &c.*,' published in London in 1691, he says:—'There were indeed two women executed, and but two in both these reigns [those of Charles II. and James II.], and they were punished for most heinous

'crimes, which no sex should defend' (p. 20.). It is generally understood that Mackenzie here refers to Isabel Alison and Marion Harvey, who were hanged at Edinburgh in January, 1681, and the 'most heinous crimes' for which they were executed was simply confessing their Cameronian principles in presence of the court, though they were also accused of having given shelter to some of their outlawed co-religionists; and, strange to say, Mr. Napier thinks they well deserved to be hanged. But it is necessary we should know something more of Sir George Mackenzie and his pamphlet.

Sir George Mackenzie was Advocate for Scotland during the latter part of the reign of Charles II. and the earlier part of the reign of James II. He was a highly accomplished and scholarly man, a friend of Dryden's, and regarded as one of the wits of the day; but he was a man of ungovernable temper and extreme royalist principles, and conducted the public prosecutions during the bloodiest part of the two reigns to which we have referred with such violence, that of all the public men in Scotland next to Claverhouse himself, he was most hated and feared. After the Revolution he retired to Oxford, but even there he felt he could not hide himself from the finger of detestation and scorn which was pointed at all who had taken a part in the hideous misgovernment of Scotland for the last twenty years. In these circumstances he resorted to the somewhat desperate expedient of attempting a vindication of his Government and himself; but dying suddenly, his pamphlet was not published till three months after his death. It is written with all the address of a consummate special pleader; but we think we may repeat of it now what was said of it at the time:—'Were this gentleman's paper strictly canvassed, it might be justly questioned whether there were more lies or sentences in it.\*' 'No man in Scotland,' says he, 'ever suffered for his religion,'—a startling statement! but no doubt justified by the Advocate on the ground that to attend a field preaching was a state crime; even to *think* that it was allowable in certain circumstances to take up arms against the Government (an article in both our religious and political creed now) was a state crime, and therefore those who suffered for these things did not suffer for their faith. 'No man,' he proceeds to say, 'was executed in his reign [that of Charles II.], who would say "God bless the King," or acknowledge his authority.' What! would this simple prayer have saved the thirty-five men

---

\* A Vindication of the Presbyterians in Scotland, &c. London: 1692.



who were hanged immediately after the rout of Rullion Green? — would it have saved the six men who were hanged immediately after the rout of Bothwell? — is there the shadow of a proof that it would have saved one of the hundreds who died under the hands of the executioner? \* ‘Nor did there die upon ‘any public account,’ he proceeds, ‘twelve in all that reign so ‘exclaimed against as bloody.’ If Mackenzie here refers to the reign of James II. he may not be egregiously far from the truth; for very soon after that monarch ascended the throne, he began to tolerate the Presbyterians, that he might have some plea for tolerating the Roman Catholics; but if he refers to the far more bloody reign of Charles II., in which he played a far more conspicuous part, he is best answered by this statement in a paper attached to his pamphlet, and in fact forming a part of it. ‘But to show the clemency of the Government, strangers would ‘be pleased to consider that though above two thousand had been ‘guilty of public rebellion, yet two hundred died not by the criminal court’ [of course this excludes all who perished by the military lynch-law of those melancholy times], ‘and above one ‘hundred and fifty of these might have saved their lives by ‘saying “God bless the King.” Two hundred is a very different figure from twelve, and besides it is here acknowledged that at least fifty of these could not have saved their lives by introducing royalty into their devotions. The recantation extorted from Margaret Lauchlison and embodied in her petition, is something very different from merely saying ‘God bless the King.’

After these specimens of the Advocate’s accuracy,—and we might quote many others,—we will not put much stress upon his allegation that only two women suffered death during the reigns of Charles and James. After all, amid the two hundred executions which are acknowledged to have taken place, Sir George may have forgotten the two Wigton women, more especially as they were not tried by the Supreme Court, where

---

\* We are quite aware there are several instances mentioned by Fountainhall and other writers of persons being offered their lives if they would say—‘God save the King.’ But we are also aware that when this was complied with, as it was in some cases, other tests were used, in the form of such questions as this, ‘Do you renounce ‘the Covenant?’ ‘Do you promise never to rise in arms against the ‘Government?’ ‘Will you take the Abjuration Oath?’ And the scrupulous Covenanter, who had prayed for the King, but could not give satisfactory answers to these interrogatories, found he had ‘sold himself for nought.’ But do not such facts only make matters worse? to hang poor people for their scruples! to make their lives depend on their praying for the King!

he acted as prosecutor, and were executed in a remote district of the country. If he did remember the case, we think he would be slow to confess and vindicate it in London, where his pamphlet was published. It is not many years since the Austrian General Haynan was mobbed and looted and half-murdered by the brewers of London because it was said he had caused some women to be whipped; surely there would have been men in London, even in 1691, who would at least have cried shame! upon the Advocate of the Scottish Government by which women had been drowned.

So much for Sir George Mackenzie. But Mr. Napier has yet another negative proof. The records of the burgh of Wigton have been searched, and no mention of the execution has been found. This will appear astonishing only if it be certain that the magistrates of Wigton were the proper parties to carry out the sentence of the royal commission. But this is by no means certain, more especially as the commissioners were appointed to *punish* as well as to try, and the sheriff of the county was one of them. It is true the commission expired on the 20th of April; but though the commission expired, its sentence would live, and the sheriff would be the proper party to see it carried into effect. Moreover, on the very day following, a similar commission was granted to General Drummond. Why is Mr. Napier so silent about this commission and its powers? It was simply a continuation of the previous one, with General Drummond put in the place of Colonel Douglas, and would undoubtedly take care that its sentences were executed. But though the magistrates of Wigton do not appear to have had any jurisdiction in the matter, it is very significant that on the 15th of April—just two days after the trial—they called the hangman before them and ‘posed’ him as to why he had absented himself, ‘when there was employment for him.’ It is evident that the fellow had some feelings of honour and humanity, and felt that he could not drown women, though he could hang men, and so had taken himself out of the way when he knew the sentence of the royal commissioners. In the presence of his superiors, however, he acknowledged he had done wrong, said he had been seduced to it, and ‘promised to bide by his service.’ To make sure that he would not bolt again the bailies locked him up in the prison, and gave him an allowance of four shillings a day. Who can doubt that he was kept there till he could be placed at the service of the commissioners to carry out their barbarous sentence?

This closes Mr. Napier's proof. We acknowledge he has raised difficulties which we have not been able entirely to lay;

but as it often happens that we cannot explain every circumstance connected with events not a week old, we must not expect to be able to explain every circumstance connected with events which happened nearly two centuries ago, and in a period of violence and lawlessness. With no unprejudiced person will such difficulties weigh a feather against the immense amount of positive evidence which we shall now produce to show that the two women were really drowned in the Bay of Wigton. We know no historical fact better established—not excepting the existence of Napoleon Buonaparte, upon which Archbishop Whately has cast far more plausible doubts than Mr. Mark Napier has cast upon the Wigton martyrs.

It is certain the women were sentenced to death—certain they were reprieved—and almost as certain they were never pardoned. If they were pardoned the pardon would have been recorded in some way or other—let it be produced. Mr. Napier has been praised for his industry in searching the public registers: in all his searches has he found this pardon? The truth is, no pardon has been found, just because no pardon was ever granted, and therefore the sentence may have been carried into effect. We have evidence that it was.

The first notice which we have of the martyrdom is in Shield's '*Hind Let Loose*,' a work published in 1687, just two years after the event. In this book it is said:—

'Neither were women spared; but some were hanged,—some drowned,—tied to stakes within the sea-mark, to be devoured gradually with the growing waves; and some of them very young; some of an old age.'

Here the reference to the Wigton martyrs is obvious enough, but it is made more certain by a rude woodcut attached to the first edition, in one of the compartments of which we have two women suspended on a gibbet, and other two bound to a stake and the tide rising round them. These are the four women who suffered death for their religion.

The next reference to the fact which we have found is in the Prince of Orange's Declaration for Scotland, which was widely circulated, especially in the western counties, notwithstanding the efforts of the Scottish Privy Council to suppress it, immediately after his landing in 1688. In that document it is said, in reference to the sufferings to which the people had been exposed:—

'Empowering officers and soldiers to act upon the subjects living in quiet and full peace the greatest barbarities, in destroying them by hanging, shooting, and drowning, without any form of law, or respect had to age or sex.'

Mr. Napier does not seem to have been aware of this evidence against him; nor are we aware of its having been previously pointed out in what may be called the Wigton Martyr controversy. Who will believe that in such a state paper there would have been such a reference unless the fact alluded to had been well known?

The next link in our chain of evidence is furnished by a very rare pamphlet, entitled 'A Short Memorial of the Sufferings and Grievances, past and present, of the Presbyterians in Scotland, particularly of those of them called by nick-name 'Cameronians,' printed in 1690.\* This pamphlet was drawn up by authority of the Cameronian Societies, and was originally

---

\* This pamphlet is rare, but not so very rare as has been supposed. There are other copies in existence besides the mouldy ones in the Advocate's Library; and we happen to have one before us while we write. Mr. Napier pretends to be very learned about it; but he is in truth profoundly ignorant both of its contents and of its history. He has learned from Patrick Walker's 'Life of Peden' that Alexander Shields was the reputed author of it; and from the preface that it was originally designed to be laid before the Prince of Orange in the form of a memorial of grievances; and he asserts positively but erroneously that it was subsequently laid before the General Assembly of 1690. Had he read 'Faithful Contendings Displayed,' he might have traced the history of this Memorial from its origin to its end. We shall venture to instruct him; and, as we shall speak 'from book,' we hope he will not be tempted to utter his favourite ejaculation,—a falsehood! a lie! At a general meeting of the societies, held at Douglas, on the 3rd of January, 1689, 'It was moved by some that the meeting might consider upon the drawing up and sending an address, with an account of our grievances sustained by us under the late tyranny, to the Prince of Orange, which the circumstances seemed to call for at our hands; whereupon it was resolved that the same should be written and brought to the next meeting, who were to consider upon the time and method of sending them' (p. 369.). At the meeting at Sanquhar, on the 24th of January, among the matters deferred to next meeting, there was 'likewise our address to the Prince, with our grievances, to be drawn up, and then and there to be deliberated upon and condescended unto.' Accordingly, at the meeting at Crawford John, on the 13th of February, 'the paper containing a memorial of our grievances to the Prince of Orange, agreed upon at the last meeting to be drawn up, was presented to the meeting and read (which because of its length, and the same being to be seen in a paper by itself, I here omit). When it was read they were inquired at what they would do with it, who unanimously resolved that the same should be sent with an address to the Prince, with all diligence, and some fit persons chosen to go with the same. They appointed Kersland and Mr. Alexander Shields to go

designed to be laid before the Prince of Orange, but this design was subsequently abandoned. Mr. Napier, though labouring under a strange delusion regarding its history, is quite aware of its existence, and has criticised its contents, but his eyes have been closed to its double reference to the Wigton Martyrdom. But as one of his admirers has somewhat quizzically said, Homer sometimes nods. In page 16. of this pamphlet it is written: —

---

‘with the address and grievances, and Dr. Ford or James Wilson to go with them.’ (P. 380.)

At a subsequent meeting, held on the 4th of March, ‘it was concluded that 30*l.* sterling should be given to the three men who were to go to the Prince of Orange with the foresaid address, ‘which sum was to be presently borrowed and afterwards to be collected in the societies and paid again’ (p. 386.). We are informed afterwards how circumstances occurred which created delay; ‘So that time and season passing over, the Prince was proclaimed King; after which the doing thereof became doubtful to some, yet others, notwithstanding, were desirous that the same might be set about for the same reasons that moved them at first to agree therewith; but still new things occurring (which produced matter of new thoughts, resolutions, and actings), that business was laid aside’ (p. 387.). Mr. Napier says the Memorial was written by Shields, and it may have been so, but if so, it was revised by the Societies and stamped with their authority. Mr. Napier says the Memorial was laid before the Prince, and chuckles over the supposed rebuff of the memorialists. Here we learn it was never presented to him at all. Mr. Napier says it was afterwards presented to the General Assembly by the three Cameronian ministers, when they sought admission to the church, and not allowed to be read because it contained ‘several peremptory and gross mistakes, unseasonable and impracticable proposals, and uncharitable and injurious reflections, tending rather to kindle contentions than to compose divisions.’ Mr. Napier assumes that the paper rejected by the Assembly and the Memorial of Grievances are identical, because Walker speaks of the ‘hard and bad treatment Messrs. Shields, Lining, and Boyd met with, their paper containing *their* [not *the*, as Mr. Napier writes] *grievances* only read in a committee.’ Simply from the introduction of the word ‘*grievances*’ here, Mr. Napier jumps at his conclusion, as if the Presbyterians of that period were not constantly speaking of their grievances, and of their grievances only. We have the most decisive evidence that the paper rejected by the Assembly was a totally different production. It was afterwards published as a pamphlet, entitled ‘An Account of the *Methods and Motives of the late Union and Submission to the Assembly, 1690;*’ and a very full abstract of it is given in the Epistle to the Reader appended to Walker’s ‘*Life of Renwick.*’ So much for Mr. Napier’s knowledge of the literature of that period upon which he plumes himself so greatly!

‘Thus a great number of innocent people have been destroyed without respect to age or sex. Some mere boys have been for this hanged ; some stooping for age ; some women also hanged, and some drowned, because they could not satisfy the council, justiciary court, and the soldiers with their thoughts about the Government.’

And again in a list of some of the most noted murders in the western shires, we have at page 35. the following : —

‘*Item.* The said Colonel or Lieut.-General James Douglas, together with the laird of Lagg and Captain Winram, most illegally condemned and most inhumanly drowned at stakes, within the sea-mark, two women at Wigton, viz. Margaret Lauchlane, upwards of sixty years, and Margaret Wilson, about twenty years of age, the foresaid fatal year 1685.’

These decisive and specific statements, originally intended to be laid before the Prince of Orange, and published to the whole world only five years after the events to which they relate had occurred, are stamped with the authority of the Cameronian Societies, to which the martyred women belonged.

In 1691 a pamphlet was published, entitled ‘A Second Vindication of the Church of Scotland,’ in which we have the following passage : —

‘Some gentlemen (whose names out of respect to them I forbear to mention) took two women, Margaret Lauchland and Margaret Wilson, the one of sixty, the other of twenty years, and caused them to be tied to a stake within the sea-mark at Wigton, and left them there till the tide overflowed them and drowned them ; and this was done without any legal trial, 1685.’ (P. 128.)

Mr. Napier speaks of this as the first specific mention of the martyrs, but we have seen that in this he is utterly wrong. But as the pamphlet is against him, he remarks of it, with that refinement of diction for which he is so highly distinguished, that ‘the plan of it is to rake together in the most slovenly and reckless form, all the rubbish of unvouched scandal and calumny against the Government that could be gathered from the gutters of the Covenant.’ (Appendix.) We read in Eastern story, of an unfortunate pastry-cook of Damascus, named Bed-reddin, who was threatened with crucifixion for having made his cream-tarts without pepper. Mr. Napier need not dread his fate, for most certainly he has not committed this fault.

Sir George Mackenzie’s *Vindication of his Government* called forth an answer in the following year (1692), entitled ‘A Vindication of the Presbyterians in Scotland from the malicious Aspersions cast upon them in a late pamphlet written by Sir George Mackenzie.’ Mr. Napier triumphs in the thought

that in this pamphlet there is no answer to the advocate's assertion that but two women were executed for state crimes during the reigns of Charles and James. We venture to think he has triumphed without having conquered. In that pamphlet we have the following notice:—

‘Nay it is sufficiently known that women were not exempted from their cruelty (persons, one would think, that could never either by their policy or strength undermine the Government, and a sex that might have expected at least some protection from the severity of the laws, from such a prince as Charles II. was), but were imprisoned, fisted, and some of them executed.’ (P. 15.)

And afterwards the passage from the Prince of Orange's Declaration, regarding the drowning of women, is quoted at length. Mr. Napier is singularly blind when reading Presbyterian pamphlets.

But every year has its own witness to this great crime. In the ‘Answer to the Scotch Presbyterian Eloquence,’ published in London in 1693, it is recorded that Colonel Douglas,

‘Together with the Laird of Lagg and Captain Winram, did illegally condemn and inhumanly drown Margaret Lauchlan, upwards of sixty years old, and Margaret Wilson, about twenty, at Wigton, fastening them to stakes within the sea-mark. This in 1685.’

Thus in 1687, 1688, 1690, 1691, 1692, and 1693, we have notices of the martyrdom. We must now overleap a period of eighteen years, but notwithstanding the increasing distance of time, the evidence gains rather than loses in force, from the peculiarly reliable source from which it is obtained. In the beginning of the eighteenth century there was a very general desire throughout Scotland that the different Kirk Sessions should collect and preserve in their registers an account of the martyrdoms which had taken place within their bounds under the Jespotism of the Stuarts, while the memory of them was still fresh. In accordance with this desire, expressed through the General Assembly and Synod, the Kirk Session of Kirkinner, the native parish of Margaret Lauchlison, entered the following notice in their minutes on the 15th of April, 1711:—

‘Margaret Lauchlison, of known integrity and piety from her youth, aged about eighty, widow of John Milliken, wright in Drungargan, was in or about the year of God 1685, in her own house taken off her knees in prayer, and carried immediately to prison, and from one prison to another, and without the benefit of light to read the Scriptures, was barbarously treated by dragoons, who were sent to carry her from Machermore to Wigton, and being sentenced by Sir Robert

Grier of Lagg to be drowned at a stake within the floodmark, just below the town of Wigton, for conventicle keeping and alleged rebellion, was, according to the said sentence, fixed to the stake till the tide made, and held down within the water by one of the town officers, by his halbert at her throat, till she died.'

The Kirk Session formally attests its belief of these particulars 'partly from credible information, and partly from their own knowledge.' The neighbouring parish of Penninghame was the native parish of Margaret Wilson, and its record, dated 25th February, 1711. is still more minute:—

'Upon the 11th day of May, 1685, these two women, Margaret Lauchlane and Margaret Wilson, were brought forth to execution. They put the old woman first into the water, and when the water was overflowing her, they asked Margaret Wilson what she thought of her in that case? She answered, "What do I see but Christ wrestling there? think ye that we are the sufferers? No, it is Christ in us, for he sends none a warfare on their own charges." Margaret Wilson sang psalm 25 from the 7th verse, read the 8th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, prayed, and then the water covered her. But before her breath was quite gone, they pulled her up and held her till she could speak, and then asked her if she would pray for the King? She answered that she wished the salvation of all, but the damnation of none. Some of her relations on the place cried out she was willing to conform! they being desirous to save her life at any rate. Upon which Major Winram offered the Oath of Abjuration to her, either to swear it or return to the water. She refused it, saying, "I will not; I am one of Christ's children, let me go!" And then they returned her into the water, where she finished her warfare; being a virgin martyr of eighteen years of age, suffering death for her refusing to swear the Oath of Abjuration, and hear the curates.'

Here then we have a narrative almost identical with that to be found in the glowing pages of Macaulay. It is followed by this attestation:—

'The Session, having considered all the above particulars, and having certain knowledge of the truth of the most part of them from their own sufferings, and *eye-witnesses of the foresaid sufferings of others*, which several of the Session declares, and from certain information of others in the very time and place they were acted in, and *many living that have all these fresh in their memory*, they do attest the same.'

We know not what better evidence could be had than that here given. The Kirk Session is a judicatory of the Church of Scotland, and consists of those parishioners who are most distinguished for their probity and piety. In country parishes like Kirkinner and Penninghame, the largest proprietors and



most respectable farmers are generally members of it.\* These are called elders, and have ordinarily reached middle age before their election. As a matter of certainty men of forty or fifty in 1711 must have remembered with accuracy what happened in the parish in 1685, twenty-six years before, more especially so remarkable an event as the drowning of women. But in addition to their own personal knowledge, they had the evidence of persons still living who had been eye-witnesses of the fact—and those who saw the sight would never forget it. What more than this could be required?

'But if this be not enough, surely the graves of the women in the churchyard of Wigton should convince the most sceptical. And we speak not of graves existing now, and pointed out by the vague finger of tradition, but of graves and tombstones existing before the generation which had witnessed the martyrdom had passed away, and while many of the relatives and friends of the martyrs must still have been living, and every Sunday passing through the churchyard where the tombstones stood. We know from the 'Cloud of Witnesses' that previous to 1714 there was a stone with an epitaph upon it in memory of Margaret Wilson; and in the churchyard of Wigton at this day there is to be seen a stone, of undoubted antiquity, on which the names of both the martyrs are engraved. But here we may be allowed to ask, if these women were not martyred, what was done with them, what became of them? In the course of nature the widow of three score and ten must soon have disappeared from the world; but Margaret Wilson, the maiden of eighteen or twenty in 1685, would be a woman of only forty-five in 1711; and thus, if not really drowned, must have walked upon her own grave, read her own epitaph, and been amused at the inquiries of the Kirk Session regarding her drowning scene twenty-five years before. But what of the relatives of these women, be they dead or alive? Our information is so minute that we can tell something even of them. In 1711 the mother

\* The following are some of the lay elders who attended the Synod of Galloway at the time this inquiry was proceeding. Sir Charles Hay of Park, Sir James Agnew of Lochnaw, Heron of Bargallie, M'Culloch of Barholm, M'Millan of Brockloch, Cathcart of Glenduish, Halliday of Mark, M'Dowall of Culgroat, M'Dowall of Logan. Martin of Airies, Gordon of Largmore, Blair of Dunskey, M'Dowall of Glen, Gordon of Garery, M'Lellan of Barmagachan, &c. The present clerk of the Synod of Galloway, who furnishes these names from the records in his possession, in a letter to the 'Kirkcudbrightshire Advertiser,' states that the mansion houses of some of them overlook the bay of Wigton.

of Margaret Wilson was still living, 'a very aged widow.' Her younger brother too was alive, and was ready to attest all that the minister of Penninghame had written regarding his sister's martyrdom. In 1718 the daughter of Margaret Lauchlison was still living, and is described by the minister of Kirkinner, who had known her for sixteen years, as 'poor 'but pious, a widow indeed, the worthy daughter of such a 'martyred mother.'

If all this is not to be regarded as sufficient evidence, there are not ten facts in the history of the world which 'may not be denied. Accordingly from this period the martyrdom finds 'a place in every history of the time. De Foe mentions it in his 'Memoirs of the Church of Scotland,' published in 1717. Wodrow relates it at great length in his 'History of the Sufferings of 'the Church of Scotland,' published in 1721-2, and at which he had been patiently toiling for the previous seven years. Patrick Walker tells the story in 1727. And last of all Lord Macaulay in our own day has given it a page in his imperishable history. The most remarkable thing of all is this, that no writer till now has ever denied the fact. In not one of the countless letters, pamphlets, diaries, histories, which have been published from the year 1685 down to the year 1862, has there been any specific denial of the facts stated in the host of authorities which we have now quoted. It has been reserved for Mr. Mark Napier to make the astounding discovery that all previous history is false, and the most perfect chain of evidence conceivable no better than a rope of sand. But it may be said that Wodrow himself acknowledges that even in his day 'the advocates for the cruelty of the period had the impudence, some of 'them to deny, and others to extenuate, the matter of fact.' We can quite understand this. No doubt there were men then living who would fain deny this atrocity and many others beside. Grierson of Lagg was still living, and, in the change of times, would be as reluctant to confess it as the murderer is to confess his midnight crime. Others through ignorance might deny it, hardly able to believe anything so dreadful. But this negative evidence can have no weight against positive evidence to the contrary, and again we repeat that till Mr. Napier arose, no writer was found so reckless as to dispute the fact.

And how does Mr. Napier get over the immense accumulation of evidence which we have produced, of the existence of most of which he is fully aware? Simply by disbelieving and calling by bad names everything which has been written on behalf of Presbytery and the Revolution. King David said, 'in his haste, 'all men are liars;' Mr. Napier has said at his leisure, that all

Presbyterians are liars. The manner in which he speaks of some of our best historical authorities is most scandalous and perfectly unparalleled. He calls Dr. Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, a 'systematic calumniator,' 'a historical libertine,' 'by nature rather fitted for the stews than the church.' De Foe is spoken of as 'a virulent collector of calumnious fables;' but his choicest epithets are reserved for Wodrow, one of the worthiest of men. He is 'an idiot,' 'a low-minded dominie,' 'a vulgar glutton of coarse and canting gossip.' We are told he believed in witches and apparitions and dreams, as if all the world did not do the same. We are informed half a dozen times that his uncle was hanged; as if it were any disgrace to die in the same cause as Algernon Sidney and Russell, and Jerviswood and Argyle. In all seriousness we say, that in almost every page of these 'Memorials' we find language which we had thought scholars and gentlemen had long ago abandoned to harlots and fishwives. But Mr. Napier endeavours to damage the evidence not only by defaming the authors of the narratives, but by showing that the narratives differ from one another. In answer to this, it is sufficient to say that independent testimonies necessarily vary. Let a hundred truthful witnesses witness the same event, and they will relate it in a hundred different ways. The horrified crowd who beheld the drowning of the women in the Blednoch, would not be all impressed in the same way with the same circumstances, and would not therefore in telling the tale dwell with the same emphasis upon the same particulars; but, while the narratives vary in the details, we hold they are singularly at one in regard to the main facts,—that in the fatal 1685 two women were drowned in the Blednoch, on account of their religious opinions, by the agents of the Government. It is highly probable that tradition added mythical circumstances to the genuine narrative. A mythical halo naturally gathers around every martyrdom; but this does not prove the whole story to be a myth. The story accounts for the myths; the myths do not account for the story. How did the story to which the legendary interest attaches arise? Mr. Napier thinks the trial of the women may account for it, but it requires a faith that could remove mountains to believe this.

Claverhouse was connected with the Wigton Martyrdom only through his brother, who acted as his substitute, and was one of the royal commissioners who condemned the women. His work as a 'persecutor of the saints' was now nearly done; but for his achievements in this chivalric field he was raised to the rank of major-general. In 1686, King James, by virtue of his own

royal prerogative, abrogated all the penal laws in the statute-book against Roman Catholics; and, to appear consistent, he, at the same time, issued a series of edicts by which he suspended the sanguinary Acts which had been passed by the Scottish Parliament against the Presbyterian nonconformists, and allowed them to meet and worship their God in their own fashion, provided they did not disseminate disloyal doctrines, or assemble in the open fields. Othello's occupation was now gone. The churches had peace; and the spirit of rebellion which the persecution had provoked, subsided the moment the persecution was at an end; but it was only a temporary lull; and the storm was now ready to burst which was to drive the Stuart dynasty from the throne. James, blinded by his bigotry, began to meddle with the dignities and emoluments of the English Church; the nation took alarm,—and his fate was sealed. Had he left the great Protestant hierarchy of the south alone, he might have done his worst with Scotland, and Presbyterianism must soon have been trampled out under the hoofs of his dragoons. In September, 1688, James himself announced to the Secret Committee of the Scottish Privy Council the anticipated invasion of the country by the Prince of Orange. Shortly afterwards all the troops in Scotland were ordered to march south to meet the invader, and Graham of Claverhouse received the command of the cavalry. While he was yet on his march, he received his patent of Viscount Dundee from a monarch who must now have felt that his only hope was in the military. Happily the military were not required to act; the demented James became a fugitive; and a revolution at once glorious and bloodless ensued.

The horse whom Claverhouse had led into England, after the flight of the monarch whom they had come to serve, made a gallant though foolish attempt to return to Scotland, but Claverhouse was not at their head. He returned to Scotland, attended by only a few troopers as an escort. He came to attend a convention of the Scotch Estates, which had been summoned by the Prince of Orange to settle the affairs of the kingdom. But he soon found himself uncomfortable in the new companionship which the change of affairs had forced upon him. Edinburgh was filled with Presbyterians from the western and southern counties, the retainers of Hamilton, and the other Whig noblemen who sat in the Convention. Among them must have been some of the relatives and friends of the numerous victims of his cruelty. He was insulted in the streets; scowling visages met him as he entered the Parliament House close; information reached him that a plot was being hatched to assassinate

him and Sir George Mackenzie. He brought the matter before the Convention; and Mackenzie exerted his eloquence to persuade the assembled nobles and burghers to take steps for their safety. The Convention took the deposition of a dyer, who declared he had heard two men say 'that they would use these 'two dogs as they had used them.' Here the matter rested. The deposition was not very definite; the Convention probably not very hearty in its desire to throw its shield over men who were universally detested; and farther procedure was rendered unnecessary by the flight of Dundee two days afterwards.

He fled to his castle of Dudhope, attended by Lord Livingstone and about fifty troopers. In a few days he was followed by a herald, who summoned him to disarm and return to the Convention. In answer to this he wrote a letter to the Duke of Hamilton, the president of the Convention, pleading that he had been obliged to leave Edinburgh, attended by armed followers, as his life had been threatened, begging to be allowed to remain at Dudhope till his wife should be brought to bed, and offering 'in the meantime either to give security or parole not to 'disturb the peace.' With this letter before him, Mr. Napier has ventured to challenge Lord Macaulay's account of this passage in our chevalier's history. 'He declared himself,' says Macaulay, 'ready to return to Edinburgh, if only he would be 'assured that he should be protected against lawless violence; 'and he offered to give his word of honour, or if that were not 'sufficient, to give bail that he would keep the peace.' What is 'parole' if it be not a soldier's 'word of honour,' and what is the difference between 'security' and 'bail'? The truth is, at the very moment Dundee was writing this letter he was plotting treason, impatiently expecting a commission from the fugitive James as commander-in-chief of the forces in Scotland, and in a month afterwards, notwithstanding his promises and pretensions to the president of the Convention, he was in the field gathering the Highland clans around the royal standard. The battle of Killiecrankie soon followed. The savage screams and fierce onset of the Gaels carried terror into the Lowland soldiery unaccustomed to such a mode of battle, and they were driven in confusion down the defile from which they had emerged. During the short struggle, however, Dundee received a musket-shot, of which he died on the following day.

Having thus traced the history of Claverhouse to its close, we are now able to form an estimate of his character. He was not the monster which the alarmed imagination of the Scotch peasantry pictured him to be. Bullets did not rebound harm-

less from his body, nor was the charger which he rode impervious to steel. He hunted conventiclers on the hills rather on account of the commission he held from the king than of any covenant he had entered into with the devil. His many portraits give him a handsome countenance, but in some of them there is betrayed a decidedly forbidding and sulky expression. That he was proud, self-willed, and of a violent temper is allowed even by his apologists. On one occasion he so far forgot himself as to threaten to strike Sir John Dalrymple in presence of the Privy Council; and in truth the best defence which can be made for many of his actions is to say that they were done in hot blood. But to say that he was hot-tempered is very different from saying that he was a man of warm affections. The very opposite appears to have been the case. So far as we can judge from the history of his marriage and of his married life he was of a singularly cold temperament, insensible to love and careless of domestic happiness. His ruling passions were ambition and greed. To rise in the army, to get possession of a forfeited estate, no matter though it were a former friend's, he would do anything, and sacrifice anything. No one will accuse him of sloth in the discharge of his military duties. He was one of the most active officers in the service, and as such he was valued by the Government, and correspondingly hated and feared by the people. The work he had to do was such as would now be entrusted to police agents or worse, but he not only did it but had a pleasure in doing it. He left his nuptial feast to search for a conventicle, he would ride night and day over waste moorlands to come upon the 'wanderers' by surprise, and if he caught an ignorant ploughman returning from hearing a sermon by Cameron or Cargill, and had him hanged on a tree, he regarded himself as sufficiently rewarded for his toil.

Mr. Napier delights to speak of him as 'The Great Dundee;' but it almost seems to be in mockery. It is like putting a royal robe on a beggar's back. We cannot discover the shadow of greatness in anything he did. Almost his whole military life was spent in dispersing field-preachings,—no very heroic work! He fought two battles; in the first he was disgracefully beaten by a handful of undisciplined but determined Covenanters at Drumclog, and was himself the first or among the first to leave the field. In the second he conquered though he fell, but the victory was due to the rush of the clansmen, and not to the dispositions of the general. Fifty-five years afterwards the Pretender gained a victory from precisely the same causes at Prestonpans; but who has ever dreamt of speaking of the Pretender as a great general? Yet the one, so far as we may

judge by battles and victories, has a better claim than the other. Dundee's greatness is to be found only in the imagination of certain Jacobite poets and writers of fiction, who have thrown a legendary interest around him which he does not deserve. Mr. Napier is fond of comparing him with Montrose. He is guilty of foul injustice in making the comparison. Montrose had some of the elements of greatness; he wanted judgment and stability, but he had quickness of perception, fearlessness, and above all things, *dash*. He made marvellous marches, and came down upon his enemy with the sudden swoop of an eagle from the hills. He fought battle after battle against higher discipline and superior numbers, and was always the victor. After the battle of Kilsyth all Scotland lay at his feet; and even in his surprise and defeat at Selkirk his gallantry was conspicuous. Besides all this he had a taste for letters, and fought not for oppression and power, but on the weaker and the losing side. To compare Claverhouse to such a man is to compare the jackdaw, which loves flesh, to the falcon which will fight for it.

We have now given our readers our estimate of the man whose *Memorials* Mr. Napier has written. We can see no heroism in hunting down and shooting poor peasants who thought that salvation depended on hearing their Presbyterian preachers, and we can have no sympathy with a biography which endeavours to whitewash the ruthless tools of an intolerable tyranny, and take from martyrs their crown of martyrdom. It is high time the mawkishness of our Jacobite writers were come to an end. We hold it is criminal even in a poet to confound virtue and vice, and to invest with the attributes of a hero the man who is deserving only of our abhorrence. But Mr. Napier has at least the excuse that he has done it in ignorance, for we are convinced he really believes that Claverhouse was deserving the appellation of 'great;' and thus can only be spoken of as a singular instance of a Tory gentleman, in the nineteenth century, exhibiting a more extraordinary phasis of fanaticism than the Covenanters and Roundheads of the seventeenth. A non-conformist himself, and happy in the abounding liberty which the Revolution has secured for him, he yet approves of men being hanged and women drowned for absenting themselves from church, and groans aloud because the Revolution has taken place.

The '*Memorials*' have no literary merits to redeem their general dulness and their betrayal of truth and right feeling. There is sometimes an attempt at wit, but it is of the Boeotian and not of the Attic kind. An effort is made to make the martyrs ridiculous by attaching '*Saint*' to their names; the

Presbyterian ministers are honoured with the title of 'Mas,'—the sarcastic humour of which is not very apparent; and Lord Macaulay's statements are called 'Macaulese,' not once, but a dozen times, as if the joke were worth repeating. We have already spoken of the chaotic confusion of the book, and the shameful language with which it abounds. It is simply a violent partisan pamphlet in three volumes, and belongs rather to the century to which it relates than to the present one. We think we can express no better wish for Mr. Napier than that his 'Memorials' may speedily go down to the depths of forgetfulness, leaving, when they disappear, a few of the letters which they contain floating on the surface; for so long as they are remembered, it will only be as a reproach to himself and to the polite literature of the nineteenth century.

We have not considered it necessary to review Mr. Napier's pamphlet upon the Wigton Martyrs, quoted at the head of this article, apart from his 'Memorials,' for it contains nothing of importance which he had not already written and rewritten in the 'Memorials,' unless it be an attack upon Principal Tulloch, whom, we think, we may safely leave to defend himself, if indeed defence be at all necessary. The small book will not serve as a buttress to the large one; the reiteration of bad arguments will not make them good ones; but we joyfully acknowledge, and we are glad to have a word of grace to say at the close, that Mr. Napier is much greater as a pamphleteer than as a historian.



- ART. II.—1. *The Druids Illustrated.* By the Rev. JOHN B. PRATT, M.A. Edinburgh: 1861.
2. *Brut y Tywysogion, or the Chronicle of the Princes.* Edited by the Rev. JOHN WILLIAMS AB ITHIEL, M.A. Published by the authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. London: 1860.
3. *The Celtic Druids; or an Attempt to show that the Druids were the Priests of Oriental Colonies who emigrated from India, and were the Introducers of the First or Cadmeian System of Letters and the Builders of Stonehenge, Carnac, and other Cyclopean Works in Asia and Europe.* By GODFREY HIGGINS, Esq. 4to. London: 1829.

THERE are few departments of knowledge in which a clearing from the foundation is not a desirable achievement, although it is a disagreeable operation: for it may have the effect of relieving the overburdened intellectual faculties of the age from a heap of ponderous and worthless lumber. It has happened to us—no matter why—to have attempted to perform this function towards the persons who figure so conspicuously in the historical and other departments of literature as Druids and Bards. Passing behind those books which assume the rank of ‘the latest authorities’ regarding them, we have looked back into the original evidence of their existence and character, and the following is the result.

First and chief of all evidence of the existence of the Druids, is the celebrated passage in Cæsar.\* So freshly is it associated with schoolboy days and ways, that to bid the experienced man look into it seems almost like asking him to resume his kite and bat. Having false recollections of its extent from the difficulties experienced in the first contest with it, he will perhaps be astonished at the brevity of the passage which has given matter for so many enormous volumes—it occupies about a page of the Delphin octavo. The Druids, as we are there told, preside over religious observances and sacrifices; they teach youth; they decide controversies, enforcing their decisions by interdicting or excommunicating the disobedient; they have a president chosen by election; they hold a great annual meeting within the territory of the

---

\* Cæsar de Bell. Gall. vi. 12, 13.

Carnutes; they make gigantic osier images, in which they burn human beings by way of sacrifice; they have traditions about astronomy, the power of the immortal gods and 'de rerum natura.' It is thought that their 'disciplina' was first invented in Britain and thence propagated, and those who desire to be adepts travel thither to acquire it. There remains still one trait on which there is dispute as to the meaning of Cæsar's words, or rather as to the words which he intended to use. The Druids are described as exempt from military service, but bound to the severer drill of keeping a public school. 'Multi in disciplinam conveniunt et à propinquis parentibusque mittuntur. Magnum ibi numerum versuum ediscere dicuntur.' The words are applicable to Eton at this very day. Cæsar adds that the pupils learn an immense number of verses in the course of their 'disciplina,' which hence sometimes extends to twenty years. They must not commit it to writing, yet both in their public and private affairs they use the *Greek* characters, and he conjectures that there are two reasons for this—the preservation of the secrets of the order, and the cultivation of the memory. The word *Græcis* is printed within brackets as an imperfection supplied by the guess of a commentator. It was perhaps suggested by Cæsar's statement a few pages before that he had written in Greek characters to Cicero the younger, in order that the Gauls, if they intercepted his letter, might not read it. Though this supplied word, as well as all the undoubted words used by Cæsar on this topic, has been a prolific source of comment, controversy, and what may be termed archæological castle-building, it is of little importance. But a moment's reflection may lead us to suspect that this description of a learned class existing throughout Gaul, in the state in which Gaul then was, is, to say the least of it, improbable.

No doubt if we were to take this as a mere outline or analysis of a work on the constitution and functions of the Druidical order, it would be capable of comprehending within it a body of detail both extensive and remarkable. The misfortune to the world is that the completion of the picture has come not from persons who had the opportunity of seeing and knowing the details, but from those whose power of intuition has been strong enough to divine them, with the aid of certain ancient monuments which they have assumed to be relics of Druidical temples and altars. As some have thus liberally supplied the missing details to Cæsar's outline, it is equally competent to others to take this outline to pieces and see what it consists of. The Celts were but too well known to the Romans long before Cæsar's day, but no earlier author, Roman or Greek, speaks of

Druids; and as we shall see, little of a distinct character is said about them after Cæsar's time. Being the first and almost the last to describe them, his statement, if accurate, is very valuable; but at the same time, its unsupported solitude exposes its accuracy to suspicion. No doubt it is very distinct. What makes the *Commentaries* so useful a book to schoolboys—and would make it so pleasant a book to men, had they not been saturated with it at school—is the transparency of the style and the distinct simplicity of the narrative. Unless where there is obviously a defective transcript, no one can doubt what Cæsar means to say. It is another question whether what he says must of necessity be true—Robinson Crusoe is perhaps the clearest narrative in the English language. As we read on, the very *flex* phenomena described after he has done with the Druids show that Cæsar could give a very clear account of what never existed. In the Hercynian forest he tells us that there is an ox resembling a stag with a single horn in its front, which after growing to a certain height, branches out like a palm tree. Also that in the same district, there are creatures called *alces*, very like goats, but having no joints to their knees; so that they sleep leaning against trees, whence it comes to pass that when they fall they cannot rise again, and are caught by sawing through the tree of repose, so that both fall together. Nothing can be more distinct than the account of these animals. A more obscure writer's statement might have been explained as an attempt to describe a known animal, but Cæsar's very distinctness enables us to know that he has described what never existed.

Then he was thoroughly imbued with the haughty feeling of the true Roman, that it was beneath his dignity to take notice of minute distinctions among those nations who, to the imperial people, were all alike classified under the generic title of Barbarians. This repulsive disdain bore some resemblance to the feeling occasionally pervading people in a certain grade of rank or fashion, that it is beneath them to take notice of the genealogical history or social condition of persons in a humbler rank unless these be their own immediate dependants, and then only, births marriages and deaths among them become worth noting. Very briefly does he condescend to notice the fact that the Germans differed from the Gauls in having no Druids at all—no sacrifices—and indeed no gods except the Sun, Vulcan, and the Moon. We know a great deal of the condition of their slaves, but the Roman writers have never said a word to help us in our researches after the origin of modern languages, not even so much as to show the difference between the Celtic and the Teutonic. That Cæsar is accurate to the

minutest particular in his descriptions of Roman warfare or engineering cannot be doubted, but in describing the tactics of his enemies he does not vary his conventional method taken from his Roman training. The reader is provokingly uninformed as to the tactics and arms of the barbarians, who, for all that Cæsar deigns to explain, might have been trained in legions, cohorts, and maniples, like their conquerors. In the very passage where the Druids are described, the other portions of the Gallic population are divided into Equites and Plebs.

But Cæsar has left a still more signal testimony to that Roman conventionality and carelessness about facts in barbarian social life, under the influence of which he dropped his casual sketch of the Druids. Having described the priests, he comes next to the religion which they professed; and just as a cockney might distinguish the officers of an Oriental court as the Secretary of State, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the President of the Board of Trade, he tells us that Mercury is their chief god, honoured with many images, and that next to him in their devotion stand successively Apollo, Mars, Jupiter, and Minerva. This has been a hard passage for the Druidites to get over, but with more than their usual prudence they have generally contrived to keep it out of sight. They could not fail to see that if this be a true account, and if the Gallic priest had welcomed and served the deities of the Roman Pantheon, Druidism must be stripped of its claims to rank with the religious systems of Egypt, Hindustan, and China as an ancient and obdurate institution, pushing its origin back into unknown antiquity, and living on from century to century inscrutable and invulnerable. On the other hand, if Cæsar, as is likely enough, had no sufficient warrant for such an assertion, this would only confirm the casual and fugitive character of the whole of his brief account of the Druids, as referring to a matter which was in his eyes of little moment, and scarcely worth being accurate about.

We have next the younger Pliny, who handles them in his own peculiar style. The passage in Cæsar, no doubt, presented a sufficiency of the strange and mysterious to awaken his love of the marvellous. It is Pliny — and he alone — who tells of the misletoe, and the ceremonies used in cutting it with a golden sickle in a white robe. It comes in as appropriate to the medicinal virtues of the misletoe, and because the Druids treated that plant as a panacea or universal remedy.\* If one half of the vast bulk of the writings of the Druidites has expanded from the passage in Cæsar, the other half may trace its inspiration to the

---

\* Plin. Nat. Hist. xvi. 95.

still shorter morsel of Pliny ; and so a large department of human knowledge has no better foundation than one of the minor marvels told by one of the most credulous writers of the ancient world. But Pliny has something to say about the Druids as appropriate to the medicinal virtues of animals, and so their name again occurs in conjunction with dragons and basilisks, as the owners of a great medicine, called the *Anguinum*, or serpent's egg. Pliny had seen one of these about the size of an apple. It was a sort of corporate deposit, being the produce of the joint parturition of a group of serpents, who held it in so much value that he who would deprive them of it must needs take to flight on a fleet horse to escape from the deadly consequences of their wrath.\*

Among other writers, such as Strabo, Ammianus Marcellinus, and Pomponius Mela, we may find that kind of stale, inanimate recasting of Cæsar's account, which gazetteers and other elementary books of reference are apt to exhibit in the present day, when one after another they repeat the marvels or peculiarities which some great traveller has attributed to any part of the world. On whatever item, however small, any early writer may add or appear to add to these faint touches of Cæsar and Pliny, we may be certain that some large and complex theory, affecting the whole history and condition of Europe from the days of Cæsar to those of Charlemagne, if not for some time afterwards, will have been erected by the busy hive of Druidical antiquaries. To pass over any one of these traces would expose us to be treated with the chastisement due to an impostor or a forger ; and as the traces themselves are sometimes so minute as to be hardly visible to the naked eye, the critic who would do justice to them and escape the charge of omission must be exceedingly careful and circumspect. For instance, it will never do to pass by the sacred groves of oak which spread their vast shade over the wide tracts of Druidical literature. These groves are spoken of by Lucan, in the first book of the *Pharsalia*, in that rather turgid flight of his redundant muse, in which he summons up all the released powers of barbarism and misrule that will take wing beyond the Alps on Cæsar passing the Rubicon, and leaving the Gauls to their own devices. The passage is the climax of the author's invocation, and he imparts a grand tone of mysterious awfulness to that strange barbaric priesthood, now that the master spirit has departed, resuming their weird mysteries in the dark recesses of their groves. It would be a small foundation, one would think, for a systematic exposition

---

\* Plin. Nat. Hist. xxix. 12.

of the creed of the red nations of America, were it reared on nothing more than Pope's lines about the Indian, whose untutored mind sees God in clouds and hears him in the wind, and expects that his faithful dog will accompany him to the world of spirits. To refer to the grove in which they were celebrated was the conventional way of giving a local habitation and a name to religious rites among the Roman authors, just as a modern missionary poet, accustomed to worship in an edifice or church, would talk about the idol and its temple. The grove is mentioned, and just mentioned only, some years later in Roman literature by no less a prose writer than Tacitus.\* Our readers will remember his vivid and picturesque description of the invasion of Mona or Anglesea by Suetonius, when the Roman soldiers were appalled by a crowd of female furies rushing about with streaming hair, uttering wild yells, and by a row of Druids with their hands stretched upwards, uttering their dreadful prayers, and invoking the vengeance of their gods. When the island was subdued, Tacitus says, in his brief way, that the groves sacred to savage superstitions were cut down. It might be maintained that Tacitus wrote here for effect rather than truth as much as Lucan; but the term grove, in that form which the Romans applied to one that was devoted to an object of worship, is certainly written in the bond, and, in Parliamentary language, stands part of the question.

If we are to believe that in ancient Europe a spiritual hierarchy ruled over countries pretty nearly as extensive as those which now adhere to the See of Rome,—a hierarchy not merely rivalling the civil power, but exercising an established supremacy over it,—history, in the latter days of the Roman empire, is sadly mutilated of its usual proportions, when it fails to give us any symptoms or indications of the presence of so powerful a body. We hear nothing of statesmen endeavouring to conciliate them, and use them as an instrument for political ends, nor, on the other hand, are we told the history of any long contest with their influence, or any weighty blow struck at their existence. For all the formidable powers attributed to them by Caesar, they seem no more objects of consideration and anxiety in his military career, than the branching-horned oxen and the kneeless stags which are their next neighbours in his Commentaries. One author, indeed, refers to political transactions in which they were involved, but treats them with an off-hand brevity as remarkable as the silence of the others. Suetonius tells us, in the compass of a line and a half, that the

---

\* *Ann.* xiv. cap. 30.

pernicious religion of the Druids, partly repressed by Augustus, was altogether abolished by Claudius. Even this inch of ground has not been occupied without anxiety and difficulty. It has not been, properly speaking, contested, but a previous occupant had to be ejected. A reading of the passage which made it not the religion of the Druids, but the worship of the Dryads that was suppressed, received the sanction of so eminent a critic as Salmasius. The context, however, is in favour of the Druids, and the triumph of securing it seems to have so dazzled their votaries, that they have been unconscious of the more than insignificance of the acquisition. If the passage be correct, a body of men whose suppression accidentally suggests so brief a notice in one of many histories, cannot have been possessed of very formidable influence. On the other hand, if the statement made by Suetonius is inaccurate, it is only a further instance of the vague indifference with which the Romans treated the whole affair.

Another historian affords us some glimpses into Druidical transactions which have been wisely overlooked by the later sages of Druidism. In bringing them forward, a preliminary remark occurs as to the difficulty in some instances of establishing the sex of the persons spoken of Druidically. They are sometimes called *Druides* and at others *Druidæ*. The latter is a feminine termination, but it may be common gender, and is sometimes used with a masculine adjective, showing that male Druids only were referred to. In some instances the sex, undetermined by the context, might appear to be feminine, but in others women Druids are specifically brought forward, not merely as no rarity, but as if the order generally were of that sex. Though they appear thus at home in Roman literature, they are by no means so easily received into the hierarchical system which modern ingenuity has constructed for Druidism, to which, indeed, they are hardly less unconformable, as the geologists say, than Pope Joan in the Pontificate.

Last in order in the collection of the miscellaneous Augustan historians, are some lives by Flavius Vopiscus. They form a small book, but it is in good esteem, from the author's opportunities of acquiring authentic information, and his simple unaffected method of communicating it. He says he was told by his grandfather, who had it on the very best authority, how Diocletian, in his early obscure days, frequenting a tavern among the Hercynians in Belgium, had some intercourse with a Druidical woman ('*cum Druidæ quadam muliere,*') who twitted him with greed and parsimony. He said, in banter, that he would be more open-handed when he

became emperor, whereon the Druidess, rebuking him for his levity, said to him, in the spirit of prophecy, ‘You will be emperor, *cum aprum cecideris*,’ ‘when you shall have slain the wild boar,’ as the natural meaning of the prediction might seem. Diocletian went on hunting and slaying great numbers of wild boars, but as he saw Aurelian, Tacitus, Probus, and others successively assume the purple, he said that he killed the boars, but others eat the flesh. When he afterwards stabbed Arius Aper, as the murderer of Numerian, he said to himself, ‘At last I have killed the fated Aper,’ and took the command of the imperial guards as the child of destiny. Aper would have suffered the penalty of his offence in the due course of the administration of justice, but Diocletian admitted, as Vopiscus’s grandfather reported, that he seized the opportunity of doing this deed with his own hands, for the purpose of fulfilling the prophecy of the Druidess. It is odd enough that this story contains two incidents of that remarkable legend of Macbeth on which Shakspeare founded his tragedy—the prophecy of a crown, and the slaughter, by his own hand, of one charged by him with the murder of the monarch to whom he succeeded. In the usual estimates of Diocletian’s character the parallel goes no further, but still some accused him of slaying the innocent to conceal his own guilt. Vopiscus tells another story, how the Emperor Aurelianus, called Claudius, consulted female Druids on the question whether the empire would continue in his posterity, and got for answer, that no name would be more illustrious in the republic than that of the posterity of Claudius, a prophecy which, as Vopiscus remarks, was in one sense fulfilled; here, too, we have a resemblance, a faint one it is true, to the prediction about Banquo’s offspring. These Druid women seem to have been a sort of Sibyls or Pythonesses, who succeeded to the older oracles. Their occupation is an instance of a phenomenon often noticed, that the more civilised nation goes to the more barbarous to find the gift of prophecy—hence the fortune-telling Gipsies and second-sighted Highlanders of modern times. Tacitus tells us that the Druids, after the burning of the Capitol, predicted from it the ruin of the empire, although all proper auspices were engaged to inaugurate the new building, and it would seem, though the sex is not apparent from the grammar, that the Druids he refers to were also women.

It seems worth noticing, that these Druidic women of Vopiscus come forward much more distinctly in connexion with the actual transaction of business than any male members of the order. So abstractly and indistinctly are these referred to, as to render it safe to maintain, that in no classic author does a



word occur importing the singular masculine of the title. They are always mentioned vaguely in the plural—the Druids. Cicero, indeed, according to a passage in his work on Divination, seems to have met in society a Druid—a rather clever fellow, well educated and acquainted especially with physiology—named Divitiacus the Æduan, yet Cicero does not style him a Druid, but mentions circuitously that he belonged to their order. A point might be made, could this be proved to be the same Divitiacus whom Cæsar found so influential among the Gauls. This, perhaps, is the nearest approach to the actual identification of a living male Druid made by any ancient author, though in reading some modern books of eminence, one might imagine that the members of the order were numerous, eminent, and well known to the public in general.

Mr. Godfrey Higgins, in the full tide of his extravagant speculations on the Celtic Druids, startles us by the heading of a chapter, ‘*Virgil a Druid.*’ The reader is left to find in the original the process by which this metamorphosis is accomplished, and we prefer, in the meantime, citing a passage in which the lovers of Herodotus will find an old friend, who made in his day a considerable sensation in heathen society, coming as he did from the countries at the back of the Northwind, in possession of the silver arrow which Apollo had buried there, and taking an occasional ride upon it through the air, after the manner of the witches of later days on their broomsticks. The personage described is the mysterious Abaris, who has for centuries perplexed the commentators:—

‘He appears to have been a priest of Apollo, and an Irish or British Celtic Druid. He first travelled over Greece, and thence went into Italy, where he became intimate with Pythagoras. To him that great philosopher imparted his most secret doctrines, and especially his thoughts respecting nature, in a plainer method and in a more compendious form than he communicated them to any other of his disciples. This is the account of the Greeks, but judging from what we have read just now from the works of their authors, I think it likely that Pythagoras might receive as much instruction as he gave. Most assuredly I would say this if it were before he travelled into the East. But I think it probable that a community of sentiment and knowledge existed between them, derived from the same fountain. Apollo was reported by Erasthenes to have hid the famous arrow with which he slew the Cyclops amongst the Hyperboreans. When Abaris visited Greece, he is said to have carried this arrow in his hand, and to have presented it to Pythagoras. Under this story there is evidently some allegory concealed, which I do not pretend to understand—or perhaps this arrow was the magnetic needle.’

So, too, Mr. Toland argued in his history of the Druids,

that Abaris was a Druid of the Hebrides, *because the arrow formed part of the Druidical costume*. If any reader is satisfied by this mode of reasoning that Abaris was a distinguished member of the Druidical order, and that all his motives and conduct are authenticated and satisfactorily accounted for as natural to his position, and becoming in a distinguished Druid, it is well; and we are not inclined to debate the matter. In the attempt, however, to discover whether there is anywhere in literature a passage identifying an actual individual male Druid as having been engaged in any practical transaction, or as having spoken or been spoken to, there is another passage in the same book which looks more like reality, though it refers to a less important personage.

‘There is a story told by Lucian, and cited by Mr. Toland, which is very curious. He relates that in Gaul he saw Hercules represented by a little old man, whom in the language of the country they called Ognius, drawing after him an infinite multitude of persons, who seemed most willing to follow, though dragged by extremely fine and almost imperceptible chains, which were fastened at one end to their ears, and held at the other; not in either of Hercules’s hands which were both otherwise employed, but tied to the tip of his tongue, in which there was a hole on purpose, where all those chains centred. Lucian wondering at this manner of portraying Hercules, was informed by a learned Druid who stood by, that Hercules did not in Gaul, as in Greece, betoken strength of body, but force of eloquence; which is thus very beautifully displayed by the Druid in his explication of the picture that hung in the Temple.’ \*

Here now is a Druid so far coming forward as a man of this world as to have an actual chat with Lucian, a person able to hold his own with most men of his day on matters of practical life. Mr. Godfrey Higgins, whose account of the interview we have cited, was a man of curious and discursive learning. His books contain so much strange and out-of-the-way knowledge, especially in matters inconceivably remote from those which he professes to have under discussion, that they have served better even than the *Anatomy of Melancholy* as quarries of old stones to literary builders; their frequent use for this purpose has been noticed in the reading-room of the British Museum. There can be little doubt that Mr. Higgins was quite as well acquainted with Lucian as with the *Common Prayer Book*. There must be some reason, therefore, why, instead of being himself the interpreter, he should, with trusting modesty, refer to Lucian through the prosy pages of Toland’s history of the Druids. The reader who has no recollection of meeting

---

\* Higgins on the Celtic Druids, p. 20.

anything about Druids, either in Lucian or any other favourite Greek author, perhaps guesses the reason. Lucian says nothing about a Druid. The person he had his chat with was *καλτος τις παρεστως* — a Celt standing by. Toland boldly substitutes the word Druid, and Higgins innocently accepts his translation. If charged with perverting the passage, he could answer, with Macbeth, 'Thou canst not say I did it!' And this, by the way, is a fair specimen of the manner in which a considerable portion of our archæological literature is constructed.

Doubtless there was a strong temptation to commit, in this instance, a small pious fraud. That Lucian had not, as he ought to have, used the word Druid was all the more provoking and unpardonable that in his use of the term *Ogmios*, as the name of the Gaulic Hercules, he had afforded the one wanting link to connect together two great sections of Druidical scholarship. There are, perhaps, some people in the world so ignorant as to require to be told what is meant by the Ogham Alphabet. It may be as well to inform these that some scratches upon stones, which our ignorant grandfathers passed unheeded, or if they noticed them, attributed to natural or accidental causes, have lately, thanks to the advancement of archæological science, been found to be the secret characters in which the Druids recorded their esoteric doctrines or other secrets for the purpose of effectually concealing them from mankind. We are told by the Royal Irish Society, in a paper presently to be referred to, that the term Ogham 'is derived from *Oc*, *Ogh*, or *Ogha*, a circle, 'because its fundamental rules were developed in five circles 'drawn at certain intervals within each other'—a derivation which, whether it be assented to or not, cannot be very easily confuted. Dr. O'Connor, the really learned editor of the great sources of Irish history in the library of the late Duke of Buckingham, appears to have been the first to discover the similarity of the name of the secret alphabet to the term used by Lucian, and the partiality of a discoverer and sole possessor seems to have in this instance led that cautious antiquary into some extravagances.

The Ogham Alphabet comes far more genially to the hand of the egregious Colonel Vallancey, who, never perplexed by any doubts or difficulties, hits off the most recondite mysteries of antiquarianism with the precision of a professor of one of the exact sciences, and provides you with a set of simple rules, by means of which the humblest tyro may read with ease those records in which the simple Druids believed that they had for ever hidden their knowledge. The first paper in the archæological

series issued by the Royal Irish Society is a report on an Ogham inscription deciphered on Colonel Vallancey's method. It was found engraved on a stone on Mount Callan, in the county of Clare. That one of the several missionaries to the spot who was most successful in solving its mysteries said that 'he was not sure that the indentures on the stone were not natural, but on observing them carefully, and their regularity, and comparing them with the natural impressions which were irregularly indented in the other stones and in some parts of this, he convinced himself beyond a doubt that they were artificial.'

When the missionaries had concluded their labours, they found that they had made out five different readings of the inscription, quite different from and irreconcilable with each other. It was farther discovered that while some of them, after the barbarous fashion of the modern European nations, had read the inscription from left to right, one adept, founding on opinions for which he was no doubt ready to suffer martyrdom, had persisted in reading it in the opposite direction, from right to left. These discrepancies, which would have sadly discouraged investigators in any other science, seem only to have awakened the Oghamites to the beautiful simplicity and flexibility of their system. The inscription was intended to be read both ways, and all the five seemingly discordant versions, with an indefinite number of others undiscovered, were of necessity quite correct. The five different readings, when placed one after another in a particular order, made a sort of epos or story. The Ogham Alphabet was thus found to resemble one of those ingenious toys in which certain pieces of wood or painted card may be so shifted as to produce one after another the separate figures of a group—although to compare this sublime ancient mystery to any produce of vulgar modern ingenuity is apt to remind one of the remarks of the Persian Embassy, when, according to Haji Baba, they saw midshipmen taking bearings at sea, and compared such a paltry achievement as the discovery of the ship's position with the feats of their own astrologers, who, by consulting the stars, could predict her safe arrival or discover the propitious hour for unloading her cargo.

Lucian, we may easily believe, was innocently unconscious of the mighty discussions he was raising by that little sketch of his, called the Celtic Hercules. He spent, it is true, a good part of his life in Gaul, and might have been an authority about the Druids, if they existed or were deemed worthy of his notice. But he was as slippery a person for anything like fact or seriousness as Rabelais or Dean Swift. The story, in fact, had no more claim to be cited as an authority upon the customs of

the people beyond the Alps than Addison's 'Vision of Mirza,' or Collins's 'Oriental Eclogues,' to stand as an authority for the religion or government of Eastern nations. Lucian intended to write an allegory, satirising some person or persons unknown, and no doubt he made what in his own day was counted a capital hit.

Of all the men of genius of the Old World none could have had a better opportunity of knowing something of the Druids, had they been the mighty hierarchy they are supposed to have been, than Ausonius, an author not to be excluded from the pale of classical literature, though he lived somewhat remote from the Augustan age. He adorned the things and men around him with a touch of sentiment akin to much of the literature of the present day. Aspiring neither to the grand march of the heroic, nor to the glittering Epicureanism of the lyric style, he found a little world of poetry within the circle of his own attachments and emotions, devoting his muse to the amiable qualities of his relations and his social circle, and to the scenery with which he was familiar.

He was a Gaul or Frenchman, a native of Bordeaux, in fact, where his father had been a physician. He seems to have travelled a good deal, dropping poetical tributes to the places which interested him. He was, no doubt, familiar with that town in the centre of Gaul commonly supposed to be the modern Dreux, which, according to Cæsar, or, more properly speaking, his Druidic commentators, was the very Vatican of the great hierarchy of the Druids. If these were mentioned by Ausonius, he could not, of course, fail to let us know, through the expressions used by him, that they were a great dominant power in the state, then flourishing or but recently deposed, if either condition had been theirs. Ausonius does refer to them in his commemoration of the Burgundian professors. They are mentioned as the ancestry of Attius Patera of Bayeux, who derives his name of Patera from that bestowed on their priests by the Apollinarian mystics, and again they are mentioned where, among the group of grammarians, Ausonius calls up the venerable Phœbicius, also an Apollonic name.\* It will be seen

The first passage occurs in the lines to Attius Patera, Rhetor:—

'Tu Bajocassis stirpe Druidarum satus,

Si fama non fallit fidem,

Beleni sacratum ducis e templo genus :

Et inde vobis nomina :

Tibi Pateræ : sic ministros nuncupant

Apollinaris mystici.'

(*Auson.* 194. 7.)

that in these passages, where they are mixed up with the Belenites or Apollonites, the Druids are spoken of in anything but a practical spirit, as undefined and semi-mythical persons of the obscure past. Descent from them is spoken of as if it were from Hercules, or Apollo, or Boreas—something vaguely complimentary, but far from distinct. One thing is clear, however, in Ausonius, that his idea of the Druids, whether as a myth or a reality, was the idea of a race or caste. This is totally at variance with that perfectly distinct statement of Cæsar, which is the origin of everything since said about them. He states that they were a priesthood created by education and training, and that their ranks were recruited from without by young men ambitious of participating in their powers and privileges.

We conclude this sketch of the evidence found among classic authors for the existence of the great system of Druidism with a feeling of considerable responsibility, since it is quite reasonable that where structures so vast have been raised out of materials so meagre, the omission of any element, however minute, will be set down as a suppression of all that the inventive genius of our antiquaries would have made out of it. As nothing farther presents itself, however, we propose to pass from the meagre and motley notices of the Druids left behind by their fellow-heathens, and endeavour to discover if there are any traces of their contact with primitive Christianity.

In the first place, we believe that Eusebius and other primary ecclesiastical historians may be searched in vain for any allusion to them. The indefatigable Dieffenbach, in his alphabetical work on the manners of the early European nations, which serves as a sort of supplement to Ducange, announces the discovery of a passage in St. Chrysostom in which the Druids are mentioned; in this passage, however, they are not spoken of practically as heathen priests coming in contact with Christian missionaries, but they are included in a general enumeration of the superstitious priesthood of heathen nations, the Magi of the Persians and the

---

The second passage is addressed to Phœbicius, one of the Latin grammarians of Bordeaux:—

‘Nec reticebo senem  
 Nomine Phœbicium  
 Qui Beleni ædituus  
 Nil opis inde tulit.  
 Sed tamen ut placitum  
 Stirpe satus Druidum,  
 Gentis Armoricæ  
 Burdigalæ cathedram,  
 Nati opera obtineris.’

(*Auson.* 200. 17.)

Brahmins of the Hindoos, side by side with a list filled up from Strabo, Diodorus Siculus, and other like authorities. In the accounts of the martyrdom of St. Alban and his fellow-sufferers we hear nothing of the cruelty of the Druids. Bede leads one to infer that his persecutors were Roman heathens, and Nenius distinctly says so. It is true that the accounts we have of this martyrdom, as well as of everything connected with Christianity in Britain under the Romans, belongs to dubious history. It may also be said that, granting it to be quite true and distinct, the area over which the Christianity of the Roman emperors prevailed had been previously cleared of Druidism, and compelled to adopt the Roman polytheism. Let us go on, therefore, to the second dawn of Christianity over those nations from which the destroyers of the Roman empire had swept the empire and Christianity away together, a waking which spread beyond the old bounds of the empire over vast territories where the Roman arms had never prevailed. In both classes of districts the Christianity which made progress from the sixth century onwards encountered the fresh primitive heathenism of the barbarians unsophisticated by classical polytheism.

It is absolutely necessary to the theories of the Druidites that their system was in full force throughout all the Celtic tribes when they were converted to Christianity by the early saints or missionaries of the North. The most lively accounts of the idols, the priesthood, and superstitious observances of barbarous heathen tribes in modern times are to be found in the records of missionary enterprise. No one can give so distinct an account of the exterminated superstition as the champion who has seen it in full observance, has examined its character and influence with an eye to its stronger and weaker points, and has at last prevailed against it. The world may generally rely on his taking advantage of the opportunities thus presented to him. He will not underrate the power and influence developed in the worldly sense of the term by the system of heathen priestcraft which he has been the chosen instrument of destroying. And certainly, if he has found in existence a subtle and unscrupulous hierarchy, who for unknown ages have exercised an absolute sway over the minds of the people, through influences founded on ancient traditional authority, and supported by majestic ceremonials and mysterious rites, he will not pass over such a phenomenon as something too trifling to be remembered or mentioned. It may safely be pronounced, however, that not one word about the Druids is to be found in that great collection of literature, since we may be assured that had the northern hagiology contained anything to assist in

supporting the opinions of the modern Druidites, this numerous and indefatigable body would to a certainty have discovered it.

The eulogistic biographies of saints do not, of course, entirely pass over all allusion to the defenders of heathenism, over whom their heroes triumphed. What is here maintained, however, is that there is nothing in them about Druids, and that wherever they allude under another name to heathen priests, there is nothing to lead to the inference that these personages belonged to any vast symmetrical hierarchy exercising a spiritual domination over all the Celtic nations. When the holy man encounters in his path a spiritual enemy in the flesh, he is generally called in the Latin biographies a Magus. Such a person will come forward to play his tricks like his fellow-magicians of Egypt, always, of course, to be out-miracled by the saint and eat dirt as the Persians say. St. Columba had some transactions with a Magus named Broichan, and the Saint's biographers let us so far into the domestic history of this Magus, as to inform us that he possessed a young Christian female slave. We are told nothing, however, about his golden sickle, his white robe, his serpent's egg, or other established ensigns of Druidical authority.

Look, on the other hand, from the Celts to the Teutonic or Scandinavian tribes and their heathenism. Both in their own Sagas and in the accounts of the struggles among them of the Christian missionaries, the whole system comes forth with more vitality and distinctness than even the Pantheon of the Greeks or Romans. There is Odin, the great Father, Thor with his red-hot hammer, ever floundering into scrapes and battering his way out of them by sheer physical force and strength of character. There is that lovely hoyden Freya, who gives a day to our Christian week like her two great male relations. Next comes the frolicsome Loki with his practical jokes, which shake heaven and earth, that prince of good fellows Balder, and the huge, lumpish, lazy tenants of Giant-land. It is not for us to say why it is that in comparison with the bold and distinct descriptions of these and other members of Valhalla, so little should be conveyed to us about the forms of heathenism among the Celtic tribes. But the fact stands by itself, that we have no account of Druidism in its latter days, either by its votaries or its enemies. \*

---

\* We offer as a free gift to any one who will accept of it, the following sources of information, to which we have not observed any reference in modern Druidical literature. In 'Martini Hamconii *'Frisia seu de viris rebusque Frisicis illustribus'* (1620), p. 106 et seq., it is set forth that Harco, Pontifex seu Præfectus Druidum, who lived in Holland in the fourth century, wrote on the immortality of



So stands the question as to the knowledge we should have of the Druids, without the assistance of the multitude of volumes of all sizes which have in later times professed to tell the world their origin and developement, the extent of territory over which they held spiritual rule, the connexion of their hierarchy with the Roman Emperors and the later European governments, their influence over early and late Christianity, the special mysteries, pomps, and ceremonies of their religion, their remarkable architecture, their colleges and schools, their views of astronomy, physical geography, ethics, and metaphysics, and many other things besides. Instead of attempting an exposition of any portion of the extensive field of Druidical literature, we shall offer an extract from an impartial abridgement of its principal features. In quoting a passage from the 'Encyclopedia Britannica,' it implies no reproach on that excellent work that we do not accept the accuracy of its statement. It is the nature of an encyclopedia not so much to criticise the received state of knowledge, as clearly and tersely to represent it. The article 'Druids' in the 'Encyclopedia Britannica,' is a concise and clear digest of the principal features of Druidism, as dispersed over the affluent pages of the 'best authorities'; and the brief passage now quoted from it will afford a tolerable idea of the distinct information, commonly received by educated persons who have not closely examined the subject, as to the manner in which the religious rites of the Druids were performed.

'They considered the oak as the emblem, or rather the peculiar residence, of the Almighty; and accordingly, chaplets of it were worn both by the Druids and the people in their religious ceremonies, whilst the altars were strewed with its leaves and encircled with its branches. The fruit of it, especially the mistletoe, was thought to contain a divine virtue, and to be the peculiar gift of heaven. It was therefore sought for on the sixth day of the moon, with the greatest earnestness and anxiety; and when found, it was hailed with raptures of joy. As soon as the Druids were informed of this fortunate discovery, they prepared everything for the sacrifice under the oak, to which they fastened two white bulls by the horns; then the Arch-Druid, attended by a prodigious number of people, ascended the tree, dressed in white; and, with a consecrated golden knife or pruning-hook, cropped the mistletoe, which he received in his *sagum*

---

the soul; and that another Dutchman, Poppo, the most distinguished heathen author of the eighth century, left, among other works, treatises 'De officiis Druidum' and 'De ritu sacrificiorum;' also that Occo, a ferocious fellow, the last of the Frisian Druids, wrote on the doctrines and the lives of the chief Druidical priests. See Seelen's 'Selecta Litteraria,' printed at Lubec in 1726, where (p. 428.) this department of literature is noticed.

or robe, amidst the rapturous exclamations of the people. Having secured the sacred plant, he descended the tree; the bulls were sacrificed; and the deity invoked to bless his own gift, and render it efficacious in those distempers in which it should be administered.

'The consecrated groves in which they performed their religious rites were fenced round with stones to prevent any persons entering between the trees except through the passages left open for that purpose, and which were guarded by some inferior Druids, to prevent any stranger from intruding into their mysteries.

'These groves were of different forms; some quite circular, others oblong, and more or less capacious, as the votaries in the districts to which they belonged were more or less numerous. The area in the centre of the grove was encompassed with several rows of large oaks, set very close together. Within this large circle were several smaller ones, surrounded with large stones; and near the centre of these smaller circles were stones of a prodigious size and convenient height, on which the victims were slain and offered. Each of these being a kind of altar, was surrounded with another row of stones, the use of which cannot now be known, unless they were intended as cinctures to keep the people at a convenient distance from the officiating priest.'

Here we are introduced to those great masses of stone projecting here and there from the surface of the earth, which, as Druidical stones, Druidical circles, Druidical altars, and so forth, are considered a permanent and convincing testimony to the wide influence of the order with whose name they are associated.

Familiar as people are in topographical works with the never-hesitating assertion about the use of these monuments by the Druids, it is almost startling to reflect that there is not one word in any ancient book to connect the two things together. The ancient authors who speak of groves say nothing about stones, while naturalists tell us that around Stonehenge and several other circles no timber can have ever grown. Mr. Godfrey Higgins dwells with a sort of wistful tenacity on those passages in Scripture in which it is set forth that Jacob rose up early and took the stone he slept on and set it up for a pillar; and that Joshua took a great stone and set it up under an oak that was by the sanctuary; and that Samuel took a stone and set it between Mispah and Shem, and called the name of it Ebeneser. But even his far-stretching ingenuity is at a loss to connect these statements with Stonehenge and Kitts Cotty House.

Before passing on from the assertion that there is not one word in any ancient book to connect the monuments commonly called Druidical with the heathen priests described by Cæsar and Pliny, it may be necessary, if we would avoid the charge of treacherous suppression, to notice Sir Richard Colt Hoare's

glorious discovery of the rites to which Stonehenge was dedicated in the old heathen days. He finds it stated by Diodorus Siculus, on the authority of Hecataeus, that over against Gaul there is an island as large as Sicily, inhabited by the Hyperboreans and containing a circular temple dedicated to Apollo; farther that the supreme authority over this temple and its consecrated precinct is vested in the Boreads or descendants of Boreas. One feels almost sorry that Diodorus had not, by the alteration of a letter or two, given a more solid foundation for a satisfactory conclusion. Had he but written Druids instead of Boreads, how vast would have been the congratulation and exultation which he would have bequeathed to distant generations. As matters now stand, it is sad to reflect that even the possession of this dubious morsel of comfort is not undisputed, since some antiquaries have maintained that the circular temple, where the descendants of Boreas officiated, was a certain small stone dome in the county of Stirling, popularly named Arthur's Oven, and better known by the execrations which antiquaries have heaped upon the barbarous owner, who took it to pieces to line a mill-dam with its stones, than by anything discovered concerning its origin or original use.

There are some who will perhaps maintain that the universal acceptance of the belief, that the connexion of these monuments with Druidical worship must have been caused by a tradition to that effect, and that such a tradition must be founded on truth, as tradition invariably is. In the instance of one Druidical temple, and that the most illustrious of them all—Stonehenge itself—the tradition of Druidical origin is impaired by the fact that a totally different tradition existed several hundreds of years ago. Giraldus Cambrensis tells us, that in his day it was called the Giants' Dance, and was reputed to have been brought over from the flat meadow in Ireland, now used as a race-course at the Curragh of Kildare; and Geoffrey of Monmouth narrates circumstantially how, through the mechanical genius of Merlin, the stones were raised and removed to Salisbury Plain, where they may now be seen. For Geoffrey's history of Stonehenge, which is worth reading for its picturesque quality, it can at least be said that none with any more sure foundation in fact has been given by any other writer; and we are not prepared to accept Mr. Fergusson's theory that the whole fabric dates from a period subsequent to that at which the Romans withdrew from Britain. Camden is as remarkably in contrast with his ambitious and feeble followers as he is in harmony with the inductive system of his illustrious contemporary, when he tells his followers not to exhaust themselves in baseless

speculations as to the origin of the fabric, but to be content with expressing their regret that the history of so magnificent an effort of human power is lost in impenetrable darkness. This conclusion is as true as it is humiliating; and it is perhaps all the more provoking that one science should be utterly baffled as to both the age and origin of a structure evidently from the hand of man, while another groping beneath affords us a lucid history of the arrangement of those strata in the crust of the earth, deposited there long ere man came into existence. True, geology, by an eruption or upheaval here and a subsidence there, occurring at perfectly convenient intervals, has an easy method to adjust the science to the phenomena. But in the successions of the fossiliferous strata, and even their connexion with the uninhabited chemical rocks, there is a beautiful precision of established science which seems to put to shame the efforts of the archæologist to deal with the most familiar phenomena of our daily walks. Nor is this all the humiliation that archæology is suffering from the same quarter. Geology has been encroaching upon its parish, by asserting possession over the curious earthen mounds, called raths and barrows, which have heretofore afforded nearly as good a scope for Druidical speculation as the stones themselves.

Sir Richard Colt Hoare, after a laborious analysis, has classified these monuments as 'The long barrow, the bowl barrow, the conoid barrow, the Druid barrow, the encircled barrow, the enclosed barrow,' &c.; but all this fine classification becomes lost if the geologists have their way, and make out the barrows to be diluvial formations left by the lakes and other waters. Nor have the geologists been frightened by the discovery of human remains within those earthen mounds. They hold that this only shows a disposition to bury under conspicuous objects, whether natural or artificial, as an arrangement more economical than the erection of fresh monuments. And here it has to be noted that the Druids have obtained some compensating consolation from this principle, since it enables them to rebut the inference frequently drawn against them from the discovery of human remains under their favourite stones, that these were erected as monuments to the dead, and not as altars for the celebration of Druidical worship.

A heavy censure would, however, be incurred by leaving the supposition that all the monuments reputed to be relics of Druidism are shapeless masses without utterance. Besides the Ogham inscriptions, there are many stones inscribed with figures that would tell us an articulate history, could we find a key to it. These sculptured stones are chiefly found in the

North of Scotland. They contain ornaments which the profane and vulgar-minded common people speak of as spectacles, cocked-hats, combs, and looking-glasses, but which the learned have found to be the symbols of some ancient and mysterious worship. The latest of those authorities, where the matter is treated of in the most recondite and transcendental form, discovers a partnership between those great dissenters from Brahminism called the Buddhists on the one part, and the Druids on the other. We are told that

“When the enthusiastic Buddhist missionaries reached the extreme West, they found themselves among a rude race, at enmity with their neighbours, and menaced by the great Roman power which had subjugated their more powerful Southern neighbours. These missionaries with the Druids, many of whom had fled from the cruel persecutions of the Romans, would unite the different tribes to oppose their cruel invaders. This could only be done by symbols, as they had no written language, and upon the erect stones already probably venerated, they traced figures to explain their Trinity, the great dogma of their religion.

‘As their influence extended, other obelisks were erected and adorned with devices to stimulate the pride of the Caledonians, while they awakened their fears and humbled their zeal for their religious opinions; and they were executed in a style which proved their intelligence and their knowledge of the arts which they had brought from the East.

‘As introductory to a specific description of the fruits of this portentous alliance, we must believe, as a leading first principle, that “the great doctrine of the Bhuddist religion consists in a Triad, “*Tri-ratna*, or three jewels, or three precious ones; that is, *Buddha*, “Spirit or God; *Dharma*, the Law; and *Sangha*, the Buddhist community, or brotherhood.” This was the genuine sense of the words to certain of the initiated; but a more clear or intelligible explanation was that *Buddha* signified the Spiritual or the Divine intellectual Essence of the World, or the efficient underived Cause of All; *Dharma*, the material essence of the World, the plastic underived Cause; and *Sangha*, which was derived from and composed of the two others. The third member is therefore the collective energy of spirit and matter in the state of action, or the embryotic creation, the type and sum of all specific forms spontaneously evolved from the union of *Buddha* and *Dharma*.’

These sublime and lucid doctrines are applied in this wise:—

‘In the great temples of Elora, and several other Buddhist caves, Colonel Sykes found three circles traced in the same order as on the coins, two forming the basement, and one the apex. This is the symbolical representation of the Buddhist Triad, which is still more accurately traced on the Kinnellar Standing Stone in Aberdeenshire,

which has three circles placed in the same order as in the temples of Hindostan, and to mark still more intelligibly the Trinity in Unity they are connected by another circle. This is the simplest form of the representation of the Trinity in Unity, and the crescent ornament underneath the circles in the Kinnellar Stone proves its identity with the other sculptured stones of Scotland. The most frequent form, however, of the Trinity on these stones is two circles, symbols of Spirit and Matter, united by a belt and crossed by a bar, to the extremities of which two sceptres were joined, to indicate the supreme power, according to the Buddhist creed the coordinate and all-originating principle. This formed what has been called the spectacle ornament upon the stones of Scotland; while the third member of the Trinity, organised matter (*Sangha*), was represented near the others in the form of a crescent.

‘Sometimes this third member is crossed by sceptres, to indicate the sovereignty of the laws which organic matter follows.’\*

With like Oriental profusion are illustrated monuments bearing such homely northern names as Dunnichen, Norislaw, Kintore, Meigle, Newton, Glammis, Aberlemno, Eassie, and Farnel. What a scientific body like the Royal Society of Edinburgh had to do with the publication of a document standing in such motley contrast with the scientific precision of its neighbours, it is difficult to imagine, though one is tempted to look to the precedent of the exhibition of the tipsy Spartan Helots. It was perhaps no bad policy to take from a quarter which could bring no scandal on their own pursuits a document exhibiting in so lively a way the melancholy results of any departure from the sober path of rigid investigation and satisfactory proof.

And now a word or two about the Bards who profess to be the historical descendants and existing representatives of Druidism, having been the literary and artistic branch of the old Pagan hierarchy, and thus entitled and enabled, without scandal to Christianity, to keep alive and even practise with renewed activity in the nineteenth century the functions of their peculiar department. In strict chronology, the first allusion to the Bards is in the passage in Lucan, previously mentioned, where, without reference to their race or country, he enumerates them among the other devotees of barbarous practices who will be left free to exercise them by Cæsar's return to Italy. It would be but a few years later that they are more distinctly discussed

---

\* Notes on some of the Buddhist Opinions and Monuments of Asia, compared with the Symbols on the ancient Sculptured Standing Stones of Scotland, by Thomas A. Wyse, Esq, M.D., F.A., S.E., Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, vol. xxi. p. 262.

by Tacitus, who places them not among the Celts, but the Germans.

Difficulties of this sort are, however, immediately got over by that prerogative method of reasoning which, in all questions about languages, counts the Celtic as the giver and never as the receiver. Pliny, having supposed that Druid, like Dryad, was derived from the Greek for an oak, is censured by Higgins, for going to a modern language like the Greek for a word still used in an ancient language like the Welsh. When we find that *dom* is Gaelic for a house, *leabhr* for a book, *ughdar* for an author, while what we call writing is expressed by *sgriobham* and *graipham*, we are not to suppose that any resemblance of these to words of corresponding meaning in the classical languages shows that they are derived from that source. If the inhabitant of Wales, Kerry, or the Isle of Skye speaks of literature in words which evidently bear a relationship to those employed by the Greeks and Romans, it must be set down without question that these latter were the pupils, not the instructors. So, probably, etymologists in some future age will show us how the *realwcy thrane* and the *nylaecthrik.theloygraf* are words of purely Celtic origin, brought into use in a corrupt shape to serve vulgar Saxon purposes. Like most things handled by a supreme authority, there is a simplicity about this method which has its attraction, as the reader will perhaps acknowledge in the following short passage, which, in the etymological adjustment of their relation to the Druids, at the same time points out, with a happy precision, the title of the Bards to represent that order in the present day. It may be necessary to mention that Strabo, Ammianus, and others speak with vague brevity of certain Eubages, otherwise read Euhages, Ovates, and Vates as co-operators with the Bards. All difficulties, however, about the distribution of the functions are removed in the passage referred to, taken from the 'Musical and Poetical Relics of the Welsh Bards,' by Edward Jones, who held the appropriate office of Bard to George IV. when he was Prince of Wales. In showing how 'the bards' were originally a constitutional appendage of the Druidical hierarchy, which was divided into three classes, priests, philosophers, and poets,' Mr. Jones proceeds as follows:—

'*Derwydd* means the body of the oak, and by implication the name of the oak, formed from *Derw*, oak, and *ydd*, a termination of nouns, as *Llywydd* and *Darllenydd*; answering the English terminations in governor, reader, and the like.

'*Bardd* signifies the branching, or what springs from, derived from *Bâr*, a branch on the top; as *Cardd* from *Car*; *Tardd* from *Tar* and

*Taren* ; also the mistletoe of the oak is called *Uchel-far*, the high or lofty shrub.

' *Ovydd* implies the sapling or unformed plant, from *ôv*, raw, pure, and *ydd*, above explained ; but when applied to a person, *Ovydd* means a Noviciate, or a holy one set apart.

' Thence it appears evident that *Derwydd*, *Bardd*, and *Ovydd* were emblematical names of the three orders in the system of Druidism, very significant of the particular function of each. The *Derwydd* was the trunk or support of the whole, whose prerogative it was to form and preside over rights and mysteries. The *Bardd* was the ramification from that trunk, arrayed in foliage which made it conspicuous, whose office was to record and sing to the multitude the precepts of their religion. And the *Ovydd* was the young shoot growing up, ensuring a prospect of permanency to the sacred grove ; he was considered as a disciple, and consequently conducted the lightest and most trivial duties appertaining to the spreading temple of the oak.'

There is no intention on this occasion of denying that the Welsh have had bards among them. It would be difficult, indeed, to find any community existing at any time on the face of the earth as to whom it could be proved that they were destitute of that commodity. Everywhere man has been found giving utterance to his musical impulses, not only by means of his own lungs, but through a ceaseless variety of mechanical devices, including organs, harps, sackbuts, dulcimers, trumpets, drums, flageolets, bagpipes, fiddles, trombones, oboes, and hurdigurdies. Of an art so universal, and so varied in its development, it is difficult to say how much or how little of it any one nation possessed, and we are willing to admit that the Welsh may have been, and may still be, a very musical people. That they have had good music, or even good poetry, for centuries will not, however, secure for their Bardic system the historical position claimed for it. The proposition is, that the British who sought refuge in Wales, retaining only their Christianity, abjured all the other elements of Roman civilisation, and re-adopted another and, of course, a higher civilisation possessed by the Celtic nations anterior to the Roman invasion. The religion of Druidism they could not re-adopt, consistently with their Christianity ; but the secular part of the system was renewed in full glory, and was even enabled to rejoin the threads that had been broken by the intrusion of the Romans, and carry back a continuous history of heroism and civilisation through many hundreds of years before the Christian era. Let us see how such a proposition tallies with the ordinary known facts of British history.

Before looking to their political position, it should be men-



tioned as a difficulty not satisfactorily cleared up, that the Welsh afford us much less assistance towards the real history of Christianity in Britain than either the Saxons or the Irish. It is true that to those who have sufficient faith to trust to the Welsh authorities alone, their contributions to the history of religion are found to be superabundant. A list of British saints given by Mr. Rees, on the authority of Cressy's 'Church History,' but from which Mr. Rees carefully withholds his own authority, commences in this manner: 'Joseph of Arimathea, Apostle of the Britons and founder of the church at Glastonbury. 2. Mansuetus, a Caledonian Briton, disciple of St. Peter at Rome, and afterwards Bishop of Toul in Lorraine. 3. Aristobulus, a disciple of St. Peter or St. Paul, sent as an apostle to the Britons, and was the first bishop in Britain. 4. Claudia, supposed to have been a daughter of Caractacus, and the wife of Pudens.' And so the list can be carried on, until it expands into St. Ursula with her eleven thousand virgins, and the twenty thousand saints buried in the Isle of Bardsey. It is curious to notice a little bit of external assistance of which this rich Hagiology condescends to accept. Martial, in one of his epigrams, having mentioned a certain Pudens married to a British lady named Claudia Rufina, the passage has been seized on as an identification of the daughter of Caractacus, and of her domestic position as the wife of Pudens. A great deal of learning has been devoted to this very small item, and when compared with the large results drawn from purely Welsh authorities, one cannot help being reminded of Caleb Balderstone, who, after enlarging on the abundance and luxury of the contents of his larder at Wolfscraig, yet puts himself to earnest exertion to get possession, in a manner not strictly justifiable, of the leg of mutton which he finds roasting before the humble fire of a neighbouring skipper.

Another desperate attempt to connect the native literature and traditions of the Welsh with something accepted within the pale of general knowledge, attaches itself to the name of Gildas, known to most people as the reputed author of one of the earliest books on British ecclesiastical literature. How much hope there may be of establishing such a connexion on a sure basis, may be inferred from what is said of Gildas by Mr. Stevenson in his edition of his book printed for the English Historical Society. 'We are unable to speak with certainty as to his parentage, his country, or even his name; the period when he lived, or the works of which he was the author.' Yet the Welsh antiquaries have succeeded, not only in estab-

lishing him as one of their saints, but in identifying him with their favourite poet Aneurin. Had both these been substantial realities, the union would have seemed as preposterous as that Dryden should be identified with Bishop Hoadley, or Burns with Dr. Blair; but shadows are more easily amalgamated than substances. It is when we pass on to the age of real and well authenticated saints—or rather distinguished missionaries among the Saxons and the Irish, that the essential poverty of the Welsh hagiology is felt. The names of Aidan, Cuthbert, Columba, and many others, are as securely based in ecclesiastical history as those of Alfred and Canute in our civil annals. But unless their claim to St. Kentigern were admitted, which it cannot be, none of the crowd of saints enumerated by the Welsh themselves have any authentic standing in the histories of the early Christian world.

Though we have just seen on what poor encouragement they will seek confirmation from other sources of evidence, the Welsh are of course, both in their ecclesiastical and their civil history, a law unto themselves, seeking no support from what may be said about them in external historical literature, and admitting no difficulties either from its silence, or its inconsistency with their own. When the outer world is told that no translation can convey the faintest impression of the powerful descriptions, the sublime metaphors, and the innumerable delicacies of sentiment pervading Celtic poetry; when it is also intimated that no extent of study will enable the stranger to master the intricacies of the language, and all its graces and enjoyments are limited to those who have had the fortune to acquire it as their native tongue, there is nothing for it but submission to the hard fate which throws us back upon the common world of literature, ancient and modern.\* But when we are told on the same exclusive authority that certain wars, treaties, codes of law, and social institutions existed in Britain hundreds of years before the Christian era; that we are to believe it because the Welsh sages, who are the only persons

---

\* The last and most enthusiastic of the champions of Welsh literature and Welsh Bards is Mr. George Barrow, whose strange book, entitled 'Wild Wales,' is a very dreary counterpart of his *Romany adventures* and his 'Bible in Spain.' Mr. Barrow traces the descent of the Bards down to a recent period; and as he also ascribes to them the faculty of second sight, it is not wonderful that these all-knowing men predicted in their 'englyn' the construction of the Menai bridge and the North-Western Railway! (*Wild Wales*, i. p. 341.)

capable of judging, say it is so ; that to question them in this their peculiar province, is as presumptuous as for an unlearned person to question the professional opinion of a surgeon or a lawyer,—we think fit to rebut the assumption, and maintain that Welsh history must be tested by its adaptability to that of the rest of the world, and to the ordinary rules of human belief.

Let us just see the gulph that has to be got over to bring the bardic literature clear down from a time anterior to the Roman invasion. Before the final breaking up, the Romans had been four hundred years among us, nearly as long as the Saxons had been before the Norman conquest. The vestiges of the roads and military works by which they held a hostile and turbulent people for some time in subjection may be traced as far as Inverness. In the province of Valencia, between the walls, they left many testimonies of the luxury and magnificence in which they lived. The wide territory to the south of the wall of Severus, —England, in short, with the exception of one small corner, —was thoroughly Romanised. It had ceased to be the scene of contention, and in a great measure to be even a land where one nation ruled and another obeyed, although, doubtless, the slave-market was chiefly supplied from among the natives. Britain was, like Spain and Gaul, a powerful department of the Empire, possessing many municipalities and an extensive commerce; and in London, York, and other considerable cities, probably exhibiting better specimens of good Roman society than the northern districts of Italy. It was a centre of intrigue and ambition in the later struggles for the purple. One emperor, Constantius Chlorus, died at York; nor was such an event spoken of, like the death of the late emperor Alexander of Russia, at Taganrog, as occurring in a distant and uncivilised province. One of the competitors for the imperial throne, Carausius, obtained his object through the political influence which he held in Britain, and was as undoubtedly Cæsar as any of the later emperors.

The Roman language, government, and manners naturally disappeared before the self-willed Saxons; yet not so utterly but that in such names as Manchester, and other places ending in chester or caster, we have a relic of the imperial times; and from the readiness with which the Saxons amalgamated the municipal system of the Romans into their own institutions, there is reason to suppose rather that they took them as they found them growing on the spot, than that they went for them to the pages of the civilians, or copied them from continental practice. In Wales, where one would naturally suppose that the civilisation of the Empire would have long lingered, it seems to have

disappeared faster than it fled before the northern conqueror. Yet down to a period later than the Norman conquest the material remains of Roman magnificence were yet visible, and Giraldus Cambrensis gives a rather gorgeous description of the palaces with gilded roofs, the temples, and the hot baths of Caerleon.\*

Yet we are called on to suppose that, about the time when the Saxons began to come over, all the thorough Romanism of Britain was abolished, and the ancient constitution restored by a vote as it were of some comprehensive kind, perhaps by resolutions at a great public meeting. The supposition, considering it for a moment as if it were a rational one, is not complimentary to the spirit of the people; for instead of leaving undisturbed the natural supposition that the Britons assimilated to the civilisation of the Italians, it demands the condition that the Britons merely submitted for the time being to their superior strength, and went back to their old ways whenever external circumstances removed the pressure of the conqueror. But if we are to believe the Arthurian literature, as it is termed—if we are to admit the reign of Arthur as rendered to us by the Welsh authorities, to be a reality—we must suppose, not merely that his contemporaries entirely and at once threw off the Roman laws, institutions, language, and social usages, but that they also at once adopted, and in its fullest developement, that social code of chivalry which did not dawn upon the rest of Europe until some centuries afterwards. Without some miracle of this sort, Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table could have had no existence. If we suppose that those warriors, who fought against the hordes of Scottish invaders, and next against the Saxons, retained but a remnant of the manners in which they were brought up, then we know that there were among them none of the institutions of feudality and chivalry. There were no great castles like those afterwards built by the Normans, where the chief and his guests and retainers held knightly wassail in the great stone hall; no fortified towers, no dungeon, or moat, or drawbridge, where the challenger sounded his defiant bugle. Knight-errantry and demonstrative courtesy to women were alike unknown, and there could, therefore, be no legends of damsels held in durance by dragons or cruel giants, until the destined champion comes to their rescue. There were no tournaments, or other gratuitous encounters, where men fought without the impulse of military duty, or of hatred, or of money as hired gladiators, or of coercion as slaves. There was no fairy

---

\* Itinerary through Wales, Hoare's translation, b. i. chap. v.

island of Avalon for the dying Arthur to be taken to by the Ladies of the Lake—nothing, in short, of that mediæval chivalry which adorns the expansive pages of Sir Thomas Malory, and glows with concentrated lustre in Tennyson's 'Idylls.' Without all these attributes, not only what is palpably fable, but what is told in the form of grave history concerning the reign of British Arthur, loses its form, its substance, and all the elements of material existence, and it becomes absolutely necessary that King Arthur should pair off with his rival Odin to join Hercules, Apollo, Romulus, and a few other eminences in Cloundland.

The powerfully chivalrous tone of the Arthurian literature naturally suggests that we should look at those great founders of chivalry, the Normans, as likely to be connected with it if any surrounding conditions justify such a supposition. Without undertaking, according to the established practice of antiquaries, to present for this difficulty an absolute solution, sacred both from confutation and from doubt, we offer it as on the whole a rational conjecture, that after the severance from Rome, and the arrival of the Saxons, the Welsh sank rapidly into barbarism, both secular and religious, and were resuscitated by their connexion with the Normans, to whose attractive influence the impulsive inhabitants of Wales appear to have been peculiarly susceptible. A resuscitated civilisation under their new leaders would account for those characteristics which are held to stamp an extreme antiquity on Welsh literature by a reference to barbarous and even heathenish customs. Where civilisation is new, matters of recent origin will possess the attributes that confer a hoar antiquity in old countries. When the New Zealanders reach the standard of civilisation to be fairly anticipated from their rapid progress, men meeting in good society will betray very recent traces of the darkest usages of savage life, when they adjust with each other genealogical questions as to whose grandfather was the eaten and whose was the cater.

Of the connexion of the Normans with the Welsh, before the final annexation of their territory and its forcible subjection to the English judicatory and executive, we have a pleasant and expressive picture in the *Itinerary of Giraldus Cambrensis*, or *Du Barri*. He was himself the representative of a Norman family, but with plenty of Welsh blood in his veins, and his story is of a progress through Wales along with Archbishop Baldwin, for the purpose of recruiting for the Crusades. Family and district contests then abounded, but there is no trace of a national hatred between the Welsh and the Norman. That seems to have come afterwards, with the final annexation.

And that the hatred of the oppressor should have obtained its tone and emphasis from himself is not unexampled in history. The oppressions of the Edwards made Scotland show a thoroughly English independence in her hatred of English domination, and the most restless and unquiet of Irishmen have arisen even among the descendants of the English settlers.

It is 'worth noting that the earlier entries in the 'Brut y Tywysogion, or Chronicle of the Princes,' speak of the Normans or French in a spirit of neutrality, if not of amity. That work is now accessible, edited to perfection, and with an excellently distinct English translation—a mighty addition to its general usefulness—among those chronicles and memorials of the empire which are printed under the auspices of the Master of the Rolls. This Brut is no Arthurian romance, but a sober chronicle, the bulk of it written by contemporaries, and only a very few brief entries earlier than the Norman conquest. We mention these peculiarities because, desirous of furnishing the reader with a typical passage exhibiting the preposterous claims to antiquity of the Welsh romantic literature, we find, and it is with regret, an easy choice of such a morsel in the preface to this official edition of the 'Chronicle of the Brut.' Here is a summary, to understand the significancy of which it is necessary to remember that the era of Prydain, son of Aedd the Great, is variously dated from the year 1780 to 480 *before the birth of Christ*:—

'The summary of the preceding authorities then, so far as they bear upon the question we are investigating, is this: that previous to the time of Prydain there was no uniform and regular method of recording occurrences; that subsequently periods of time were computed from his era; that this mode was continued until after the introduction of Christianity into the island, when, to some extent, the year of Christ was adopted; that the bards for the most part adhered to the old rule of *Cov á Chyvriv* until the time of Arthur, when events that occurred before the Christian era were enjoined to be dated according to the age of the world, and subsequent events from the Nativity; that Howel the Good ordained chronological records to be dated from the year of Christ's coming in the flesh; and that until a comparatively late period, the bards were in the habit of dating the holding of their congress sometimes simply from the era of Prydain, sometimes from that and the era of Christ conjointly, though it would seem that other events have been chronicled by them invariably after the Christian mode, and there is every reason to believe that a few of the historical Triads are genuine memorials of Druidic times; for though they might not have been committed to writing until perhaps the twelfth century, yet it is very probable that they were respectively compiled when the last event of each was still fresh in the memory. Internal evidence

points to the remotest antiquity. Being thus framed, they would be publicly recited at the periodic festivals of the bards, and the repeated recitation would be the sure means of preventing all interpolation and corruption. Indeed, written literature might be more easily tampered with in those days than oral traditions, thus, as it were, nationally stereotyped. The only circumstance that would affect their transmission would be the impracticability of meeting in a national convention, as, no doubt, was the case during parts of the Roman domination. Whenever that difficulty offered itself, the duty of preserving such records devolved upon individual members of the Bardic Institute, meeting in groups of twos or threes, and interchanging communications couched in the language of secrecy.' — (*Brut y Tywysogion*, p. xii.)

The Rev. John Williams Ab Ithel, Rector of Llanymowddwy, who is the author of these remarks, draws largely on our credulity. But Scotland has resigned a long catalogue of fictitious kings, and Ireland has thrown adrift a still larger bulk of fabulous history. Wales will have to follow the example, although she holds her precious deposit of marvels, not only for herself, but in trust, as it were, for the whole island of Britain. There are few instances where the resignation of cherished historical fable has so ample a compensation in literary glory. That the gorgeous collection of romance invented or repeated by Geoffrey of Monmouth went at once to the heart of chivalrous Europe, and spread over the literature of almost every Christian land a spirit which had its origin in Wales, cannot be doubted. Whoever desires to behold the full efficiency of this influence, brought to his comprehension in translations alike remarkable for their learning and their genius, let him go to the three volumes of the *Mabinogium* of Lady Charlotte Guest.

But the inference to be drawn from the facts we have been collecting, and from the absence of all tangible contemporary evidence, compels us, however reluctantly, to efface from the pages of history those stately and shadowy forms which have flitted for centuries through the groves of Avalon, and peopled the sanctuaries of an extinct religion. Had the Druids and Bards really existed in those periods in which they have been described, had they really exercised the powers imputed to them over the religion, the literature, and the arts of a great people or of immense tribes, it is scarcely possible to conceive that all positive evidence of their authority would have disappeared. We think ourselves justified, then, in concluding that the place they really fill in history is indefinite and obscure; and that the attempt to give a more precise form to these traditions by ingenious conjectures has been for the most part unsuccessful.

ART. III.—*History of the Modern Styles of Architecture: being a Sequel to the Handbook of Architecture.* By JAMES FERGUSSON, Fellow of the Royal Institute of British Architects. London: 1862.

MR. FERGUSSON has worthily completed an important work. He has traced the history of architecture in every country of the world, from its crude infancy through the several stages of its greatness and decay. Few will deny that the undertaking required great courage and no scanty measure of judgment, taste, and learning; but none, perhaps, will read his *History of the Modern Styles* without feeling that, although it fully sustains his reputation, Mr. Fergusson has found the sequel of his work the less congenial portion of his task. In his '*Handbook of Architecture*' he had to deal with styles which were the result of a real growth and a genuine developement of art: but it was not this circumstance alone which imparted to his earlier volumes their peculiar charm. In a series of brilliant sketches he displayed the characteristics and the spirit which marked the art of Greece and Rome, of Assyria, Persia, and Egypt; and his pictures were, on the whole, no less truthful than brilliant. If, while reviewing his *Handbook*\*, we disputed the theory which affiliated Greek architecture on that of Egypt, and if we objected still more strongly to his account of the Christian styles as the least satisfactory portion of the work, we welcomed with gratitude the admirable treatise on Eastern Art, in which Mr. Fergusson has had no rival. With the Asiatic styles in general, and preeminently with those of India, he is thoroughly familiar; and the only regret in the minds of English readers is, that he had not examined at greater length buildings of which they know so little. If in his volume on Christian Art we found much valuable criticism, in his chapters on Asiatic architecture we were indebted to him for a real addition to our stock of knowledge. In his present volume Mr. Fergusson goes over no such new ground. Renaissance works are scattered about over well-nigh the whole face of the civilised globe. We may see entablatures and pediments and peristylar temples, without the trouble of going to the countries in which these forms were first adopted. The change in his subject has had its effect on the author's feelings. The

---

\* Ed. Rev., No. cexiii.



tone of the Handbook was more than cheerful; the tone of the present volume is not altogether inspiriting. A melancholy catalogue enumerates the signs of a disease well-nigh past curing; and the only remedy proposed is one which it seems impossible to apply. It is no exaggeration to say, that he has allowed his artistic taste to make him needlessly censorious, and led him to treat the whole subject in a way which barely escapes the charge of being crotchety. His general survey of modern art has brought him to the conclusion that all architectural styles, including the first stage of the Renaissance, were truthful, while all later styles have been imitative or copying. In the former, ornamentation 'either grew naturally out of the construction, or was such as was best suited to express the uses or objects to which the building was to be applied;' but since the Reformation, with the exception of mere utilitarian designs, probably not one truthful building has been erected in Europe. Still ornamental forms, although avowedly borrowed, may be rightly applied. The classical shaft and capital, used as a support, is as much in its right place as a Gothic pier. Attached to a wall, where it supports nothing, it is put to a use for which it is not adapted, and which is therefore wrong. The application of this test draws a broad line between the first stage of the Renaissance and all later styles. As long as the architects applied classical ornaments rightly, their art was in a healthy and hopeful condition: as soon as bits of entablature were thrust in where they were not wanted, or columns were converted into mere ornamental appendages, the doom of the style was sealed. But the era of the Renaissance opened with the sojourn of Brunelleschi in Rome during the early part of the fifteenth century. If this date enables Mr. Fergusson to treat as belonging to this style some of the finest palaces of Florence and Venice, it cuts down the true Renaissance to a short life indeed. Brunelleschi returned to Florence in 1420: he died in 1444. During the interval he erected buildings in which pieces of entablature were thrust between the pier and arch, and so left to his successors 'the most fatal gift of Classic Art to modern times' (p. 42.). A period of twenty years leaves for the true Renaissance, as for the Geometrical Gothic style, little more than a philosophical existence. But the scanty limits within which alone he can find buildings deserving genuine praise, widen proportionately the field for trenchant criticism. Mr. Fergusson is a severe censor, and he is impartial in his severity. To copy a Greek or a Roman building is in his eyes scarcely less abominable than to copy a Gothic one. Columns and entablatures, pediments and pilasters, are almost as vehemently

proscribed by him as clustered shafts and pointed arches. To build now as Englishmen built four centuries ago is only more absurd than to follow the fashions of classical antiquity. The number of modern Gothic churches in England rouses his indignation :—

‘ There is not a town, scarcely a village, in the length and breadth of the land, which is not furnished with one of these forgeries : and so cleverly is this done in most instances, that, if a stranger were not aware that forgery is the fashion instead of being a crime, he might mistake the counterfeit for a really old Mediæval church.’ (P. 342.)

The new Houses of Parliament are still more severely criticised :—

‘ Here it was determined to go a step further. Not only the exterior, but every room and every detail of the interior, was to be of the Tudor age. Even the sculpture was to be of the stiff formal style of that period ; Queen Victoria and her royal uncles and ancestors from Queen Elizabeth downwards, were all to be clothed in the garb of the earlier period, and have their names inscribed in the illegible characters then current. Every art and every device was to be employed to prove that history was a myth, and that the British Sovereigns, from Elizabeth to Victoria, all reigned before the two last Henrys ! Or you are asked to believe that Henry VII. foresaw all that the lords and commons and committees would require in the nineteenth century, and provided this building for their accommodation accordingly. The Hindoos were actuated by the same childish spirit when they wrote their past history in the prophetic form of the Puranas. The trick hardly deceives even the ignorant Indian, and does not certainly impose on any Englishman.’ (P. 343.)

There is, of course, the simple answer that no deception or imposition was intended ; but the censure is in part deserved. If we have no national architecture, there may be no shame in adopting older forms which we find suitable for given purposes ; but the attempt to disguise the conditions of society at the present day in a classical or a Gothic garb is beneath contempt. In the northern aisle of the nave of Westminster Abbey, the visitor is attracted by a memorial brass, representing a knight and his wife, who may have lived under the later Plantagenet kings. If he has not seen the Abbey for some time, he may wonder that it never caught his eye before, until, on spelling out the archaic characters of the inscription, he finds that the knight, to whose memory it was laid down, fought under Abercromby in Egypt. In the same aisle, a coloured window representing in mediæval guise certain mechanical works and feats of engineering, of which no one in the middle ages knew anything, may in like

manner perplex him until he learns that the window is a memorial to the greatest railway engineer of the present age. But while in matters relating to our common life we are becoming more truthful, we are not, apparently, much nearer to the origination of a new style of architecture. In proportion as they depart from mere naked construction, our architects seem unable to escape from the magic circle of copying or adaptation. Mr. Fergusson denies that there is the slightest reason for a state of things which they have accepted as a necessity. His opponents will probably turn to this very volume for the justification of the existing practice.

In the fifteenth century the Italians discarded Gothic in favour of classical ornamentation. When in the seventeenth century classical forms found their way into England, the triumph of the new fashion was complete; and from that time to the present the designs of all architects have been more or less imitative. But when Mr. Fergusson states broadly, 'that there are in reality two styles of architectural art, one 'practised universally before the sixteenth century, and the 'other since then' (p. 4.), he has passed over one exception, which would tell inconveniently against this sweeping rule. If the architects of the Cathedral of Dijon took to copying when they clothed its western front with pilasters and entablatures, the ancient Roman architects were guilty of the same offence when they disguised their genuine arched construction under forms borrowed from Greek art, or cast that construction away altogether. Of the two, the latter were incomparably more blameworthy. In the principle of their national architecture the Romans possessed a mine of inexhaustible wealth. From it sprang directly the Romanesque and then the Teutonic\* developements of Christian art; and all the effect which the introduction of Greek forms had, was to arrest for several centuries this growth of the really living style which they cramped and stunted. With the Gothic architects of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the case was wholly different. The goodly tree which had yielded its fruits for a thousand years was withered and dead. The exaggerated richness of the chapel of King's College at Cambridge had been eclipsed by the prodigal magnificence of the Chapel of

---

\* We use this term as expressing in a single word the fact that Gothic, or pointed architecture, is the art really of only the Teutonic as distinguished from the Romance nations of Europe. It seems also to keep the religious reformation more thoroughly distinct from the revolution in art.

Henry VII. at Westminster; and this transient blaze of false glory was succeeded by a contented acquiescence in the poorest and the most debased forms, long before John of Padua designed Longleat, or Inigo Jones drew out his plans for Whitehall.

The result was inevitable. The intrusion of any new fashion was sure to thrust aside what was now nothing more than an effete tradition; and the Renaissance forms came in with all the force which could be imparted to them by the revival of classical learning. The Italians had never really loved or understood Gothic. To them, therefore, the classical architecture of their forefathers was a style not only more congenial, but, as it seemed, not thoroughly developed. Taken up with enthusiastic devotion, this style appeared, at first, likely to realise their brightest anticipations. How soon this prospect was clouded, the reader will best learn from Mr. Fergusson's pages. He will there see that the Italian or 'common sense' style, which Mr. Fergusson upholds as the only possible means for extricating us from our habits of servile imitation, has itself been exhausted, scarcely less than the Gothic.

The possibility or likelihood of future progress is, therefore, a question altogether distinct from the history of the modern styles; and Mr. Fergusson is perfectly right in saying that, from whatever point of view it may be regarded, that history must be to us a subject of very deep interest. 'Either it is wrong in us to persevere in copying, in which case we ought to despise the history of this style; or, if we are justified in our present practice, we cannot be mistaken in studying the steps by which we have arrived at its principles, and, by an impartial criticism, attempting to estimate their value' (p. 4.). The inquiry may reveal the real cause which prevents the immediate invention of a new style; it must remove very much of the mystery with which we are apt to invest the introduction of the Renaissance designs. The results of that change are before us; but we are too commonly disposed to assume not only that the revolution was sudden, but that it encountered the real resistance which any living style of art must oppose to any other which may assail it. The countries which most eagerly took up the cause of the Reformation were the last to be invaded by the spirit of Renaissance art; and in England generations which had not known by experience the yoke of the Papacy adhered, however feebly or ignorantly, to the architecture of their forefathers. Precisely because their adherence was so weak, the victory of classical forms when once introduced was rendered certain and lasting. The uncouth splendours of Egyptian art were no temptation to the men who

built and adorned the Parthenon; and the beauties of the classical orders would have been displayed to little purpose before those who were rearing the noble piles of Westminster, or Salisbury, or Lincoln. A perusal of Mr. Fergusson's pages would scarcely convince the reader, that the introduction of foreign forms could not in England or in France have been effected in the days of William of Wykeham or Wilars de Honcourt.

But an examination of the causes which rendered that possible in the time of Inigo Jones which was impossible in the days of the great Bishop of Winchester, must throw some light on the conditions under which we may look for the invention of a new style of architecture which not by a metaphor, but in strictness of speech, shall deserve the name of national. If in this, the most practical of all questions connected with the art, Mr. Fergusson's judgment is not so clear or so decisive as it might have been, we impute it simply to the want of that philosophical view which somewhat marred his account of the Gothic styles in the 'Handbook of Architecture,' and which, in spite of the correctness of his taste, and his general impartiality, renders him a less authoritative judge of Gothic than of other forms of art.

That the inadequate treatment of these two points involves some important consequences, we do not attempt to deny. But having said thus much, we have no further abatements to make from the expression of our hearty concurrence with the spirit and tone of Mr. Fergusson's criticisms. His 'History of the Modern Styles' displays the same honest appreciation of the beauties of every form of art, it has the same uncompromising exposure of their faults. Of the clearness and force with which he has everywhere laid bare the conditions of all architectural excellence, it would be hard to speak too highly; nor is our opinion on this point in any way modified, because we do not altogether concur in his practical suggestions for the removal of inconsistencies which we cannot disclaim and absurdities which we cannot conceal. It is, indeed, impossible that such a book should be published without doing great good; and probably there is no architect now living who will not be grateful to Mr. Fergusson for the method in which he has discussed the present state and the prospects of architecture throughout Europe. But, beyond this, there is much in the mere history of Renaissance art to make such a volume welcome. We cannot question the fact that there is now scarcely such a thing as really original design. Some centuries ago there was no design which was not original; but the changes which have brought

about a result so marvellous by no means exhibit a constantly increasing degradation. The character which Renaissance architecture came to bear is widely different from that with which it started; and from time to time in its history there has been, especially in this country, a return to older forms. If Mr. Fergusson has not given a due weight to the protest which has left us such works as the chapel of Wadham College, Oxford, the distinction between the elder and later Renaissance in Italy and elsewhere has furnished him with a philosophical classification of later styles which unfortunately he has not attained in treating of the Gothic styles. The minute carefulness with which this distinction has been traced out constitutes the great merit of the work; and a better prospect will open before us when we honestly accept his conclusions, and confess that the most exquisite of the Gothic buildings, which have risen, or are rising around us, are copies not less than the Roman porticoes which are made to do service in our halls and palaces. But this confession will, in its turn, involve a charge of inconsistency in the view which Mr. Fergusson takes of Gothic and classic purism. If, without reference to the forms which they employ, our architects uniformly speak in a dead language, it is not easy to see why the retention of Italian forms should show greater freedom of thought or more of common sense than the retention of forms which at one time unquestionably met every want of our English forefathers. In one sense it may be said that the Anglo-Saxon is a dead language for us, but our present speech stands in a nearer relation to it than to the Romance dialects of Southern Europe.

In such questions as these, palpable exaggerations will serve no good purpose; and Mr. Fergusson is scarcely consistent with the general principles of his book when he tells us that since the Reformation there is no building, 'the design of which is 'not borrowed from some country or people with whom our 'only associations are those derived from education alone, wholly 'irrespective of either blood or feeling' (p. 3.). If we borrow from the choir of Lincoln or the nave of Lichfield, we copy, but we copy from the works of those from whom we are lineally sprung, and who aided in no slight measure to raise the fair and goodly fabric of our English freedom.

If, however, the Reformation was not immediately connected with the introduction of Renaissance forms into Northern Europe, Mr. Fergusson is right in saying that it had the effect of arresting or repressing the passion for church-building which continued unchecked in Italy. But in Italy, the stronghold of

the Papacy, the revival of classical learning had already effected what it was long in achieving elsewhere. It had imbued all classes with a love of architectural forms which were certainly more congenial to them than those which they beheld in the great churches of Assisi, Vercelli, or Milan. The shell of the building might continue to be Gothic, but the ornamentation must be borrowed from the gifted people over whose recovered lore they hung with rapt attention. At first, however, there was an honest effort to adhere to the truthful construction of the mediæval architects; and so long as they did so, the return to classical forms was no subject for regret. At no time was the Italian filled with a real love for clustered shafts and groined vaulting. Still less had he any genuine apprehension of the principles which determined the course of Northern architecture. He was utterly unable to see in what way Westminster Abbey differed from the minsters of Peterborough or St. Albans, or to determine the stages in the art which are marked severally by the cathedrals of Salisbury, Amiens, and Cologne. The employment of Northern architects was a natural consequence of this inherent distaste for an art which was alien to his soil. The magnificence of the great Northern churches inspired a wish to see buildings not wholly unlike them at Vercelli or Milan; but when the Italian took to building Gothic himself, the result was seen in such structures as the church of Santa Maria della Spina at Pisa. It was better to discard outright a system of decoration which, in his hand, issued in a series of fantastic vagaries; and the few examples which exist of the truthful application of classical forms serve at least to show that a genuine architecture might have been matured, if its growth had not been arrested by obstacles which it was almost impossible to avoid. Yet, if ever so real a style had been produced in Italy, we may at once confess, and Mr. Fergusson's admissions will furnish ample grounds for concluding, that the style so invented could never have fulfilled all the conditions of a national style for the countries north of the Alps.

But in reality the genuine Renaissance was so evanescent that it must be regarded more as a sign than an accomplishment of a genuine architectural reformation even in Italy. The Christian styles had come into existence by casting aside the entablature, from all disengaged columns\*: for the Italian of

---

\* This essential distinction between Christian styles and the earlier Roman architecture is clearly laid down in Mr. Okely's valuable work on 'Christian Architecture in Italy.' (*Introduction*, p. 3.)

the fifteenth century there was an irresistible temptation to return to it. In England, as in France and Germany, the true growth of the art had produced a system of ornamentation which was at once constructively truthful and boundless in its resources. The Italian, for whom the exterior of the early basilicas furnished no decorative features whatever, could only repeat on his walls the columns and entablatures which graced the temples of ancient Rome. In other words, the architecture of the North arose by discarding from the genuine forms of Roman construction the ornamentation which had been absurdly borrowed from Greek art. The Italian Renaissance reverted almost immediately to the bondage with which Rome voluntarily cramped and fettered her own enormous constructive powers.

Hence, as the Renaissance ceased, almost at the outset, to exhibit the working of a living principle applicable to all buildings, whether ecclesiastical, military, or domestic, the history of modern styles resolves itself into little more than the history of modern architects.\* The system of Inigo Jones, Wren, or

---

\* Mr. Fergusson has, however, greatly overstated his position in saying that no names of mediæval architects have come down to us. Even if we had no records, we should not be justified in concluding that 'probably nobody knew even then who the architects were, more than we know now who designed the "Warrior."' But there is no such dearth of records, and it is unfair to write as though we had never heard of Geoffrey de Noyers at Lincoln, or seen the sketch book of Wilars de Honcourt, which also contains some of his original designs. These drawings illustrate most forcibly the great distinction between the constructive decoration of the mediæval builders and the superficial ornamentation of modern architects. A glance at the sketches of Wilars shows at once of what building they are the designs; but we receive from them a general notion of the form and proportions of the edifice, and nothing more. Probably not one single ornamental detail in the sketch accurately represents the actual details of the building; but neither architect nor builder needed such exact drawings. The edifices literally grew under their hands; the modern architect has his building ready dressed on paper at the shortest notice. Nothing can be more detrimental to genuine architecture than the pictorial character it has acquired from the elevations or designs on flat surfaces relied on by modern architects. Hence the notion has sprung up that the ugliest conceivable form can be beautified by the addition of superficial ornament. But for such a notion we should never have seen a design for improving buildings so utterly wanting in every condition of architectural beauty as the South Kensington galleries. The most lavish decoration could not hide their real character, while it would probably render the absence of all the true principles of art still more apparent.



Vanbrugh, does not exhibit the same sequence from that of Brunelleschi or Bramante, which marks the growth of the Continuous or Flamboyant from the earlier stages of Gothic architecture. We are concerned, therefore, not so much with the developement of particular principles, as with the works of particular men; and we are at once thrown back in our criticisms on certain canons of taste, which may be made subjects of controversy. If it is impossible to avoid this when we compare the works of any one style with those of another, the difficulty is increased when one of these is a true and the other a copying style. We may be at a loss to determine whether the Presbytery of Ely is more beautiful than the Chapel of King's College, Cambridge; but we can at once say whether they are or are not inconsistent with the laws of construction and decoration which regulate their respective styles. It is quite another thing, if we compare the Temple of Theseus with the Minster of Beverley, or even the details of the one with the details of the other: nor do such comparisons appear likely to lead to any ultimate agreement. When San Gallo made his designs for St. Peter's at Rome, he was deliberately applying a system of ornamentation to uses for which it was not primarily intended. But the clustered shafts and continuous lines which seem to give infinity to the nave of Winchester, are the direct result of principles involved in that massive Romanesque construction which these clustered shafts do but encircle. When, therefore, Mr. Fergusson says, that 'with the simpler lines and more elegant details of classic art, 'a far more pure and majestic building would' (with a slight alteration of San Gallo's dome) 'have been the result than any 'Gothic cathedral we have yet seen' (p. 57.), he seems to us to beg not one question only, but three or four. It is very possible that he may be right, and they who differ from him wrong; but there is little profit in a debate on the abstract beauty of a Corinthian or a Gothic capital.

But there is indisputably both beauty and grandeur in many Renaissance buildings; and it becomes a subject of no slight interest to determine how that grandeur and beauty was obtained. Mr. Fergusson has approached, as nearly as any writer, to that impartiality in the examination of all styles, without which a real knowledge of any style becomes impossible. And if his criticism tells little in favour of the principles which have guided the Renaissance architects, they furnish but slender consolation for those whom he delights to set down as Gothic purists. If the former have not invented any genuine style, the latter seem scarcely on the road to do so now. In copying

the cathedrals of Wells or Ely, we may be imitating the works of our forefathers, but we are no more producing anything of our own than if we build a fac-simile of the Erechtheion. And if, while doing the former, we anathematise the latter as involving the essence of heathenism, we show our absurdity not less than our bigotry. Mr. Fergusson has an honest horror of all copying; and if he seems to think that to masquerade in a classical dress is less absurd than to masquerade in a Gothic garb, this has not withheld him from rating at their true value the achievements of Renaissance architects. When he proves that their whole apparatus for the exterior and internal treatment of buildings was confined to the classical order with its entablature and pediment, and that these were almost always misapplied, his censure is as severe as any that could be pronounced by the most partial lovers of Gothic architecture.

But the irresistible tendency of the Renaissance to absolute copying is still more forcibly brought out by the fact, that of the greatest Renaissance structures many are classical in their details alone, while their forms are reproductions of early Christian basilicas or of Gothic or Byzantine buildings. Mr. Fergusson has carefully noted the facts; it may be regretted that he has not as prominently set forth the inference which must be drawn from them. In the hands of the Greek architect the column was a strictly constructive feature. However scientific may have been the rules which determined the length of the shaft or the swell of the entasis, it remained the representative of the wooden post thrust into the ground to support the roof which was raised above it. By an utter departure from its original purpose it became in Roman hands the appendage of a wall where it supported nothing. The Renaissance architects followed eagerly the example thus set them, and from the use of semi-detached columns went on to employ pilasters, 'one of the most useless as well as least constructive modes of ornamentation that could be adopted,' which, in Mr. Fergusson's judgment, not only gave a character of unreality to the style, but 'betrayed that continual striving after imitative forms, which is its bane' (p. 9.). From the employment of such columns and pilasters on useless porticoes, the step was inevitable which led to their employment on the walls of houses, where they give no support whatever. This was, in Mr. Fergusson's words, a further step 'in the wrong direction; it was employing ornament for ornament's sake, without reference to construction or the actual purpose of the building; and, once it was admitted that any class of ornament could be employed, other than ornamental construction, or which had any other aim

'than to express — while it beautified — the prosaic exigencies of the design, there was an end of all that was truthful, or that can lead to perfection in architectural art' (p. 26.). Thus the columns, which ought always to be independent supports, and which, even if engaged, should suggest the idea of buttresses, served at length simply to indicate internal arrangement, and were separated into distinct layers by large entablatures which utterly preclude all real unity of design. More than any other cause, probably, this want of connexion between the parts led to that exaggeration of the orders, which, as Mr. Fergusson rightly asserts, marks the worst stage of Renaissance architecture. It would be invidious to depreciate the graceful beauty or the solemn grandeur of many of the palaces in Venice or Florence; but it is impossible to view the fronts of the Riccardi (p. 84.), the Rucellai (p. 86.), and Guadagni (p. 88.) palaces in the latter, or the Grimani palace (p. 27.) in the former (if these may be regarded as Renaissance buildings), without feeling that there is no reason why, instead of having three or four stages, they should not have either less or more, and that the design would not be essentially affected by the change. It is true, indeed, that some of them exhibit no orders, or, it might almost be said, no classical details at all, and make no pretension to classical uniformity of arrangement, while others show more of Gothic than of classical feeling. The extent of this Gothic feeling in the courtyard of the Doge's Palace (p. 91.), is attested not only by the presence of pointed arches in the second tier, but by banded shafts and arches springing straight from the capitals (without the intervention of an entablature) in all the stages. But here, after the somewhat oracular fashion which in a treatise on copying styles is perhaps unavoidable, we are told that this use of the pointed arch is not happy, as in itself it is not a pleasing feature, and, when nakedly used, always unpleasing. We will not further complicate the subject by giving any judgment of our own.

On the whole, it is not easy to determine precisely what was gained, when Brunelleschi designed the Church of the Holy Spirit at Florence, or Bramante built the church at Lodi. In the former, the classical details are used, to adopt Mr. Fergusson's words, 'with singular elegance and purity' (p. 42.). But the design is in fact a return to the simplest form of the Basilican church. The windows are mere round-headed apertures, while the clerestory is separated from the pier-arches by what is practically nothing more than an exaggerated stringcourse. Were it not for the presence of a single feature, it might fairly be classed among buildings of the Basilican age; but that feature

stamps it as belonging to a class essentially different, and the fragment of entablature interposed between the capital and the arch was the pledge and sign of the coming passion for mere imitation. We cannot add to the strength of the condemnation which denounces in this typical form of the Renaissance 'the 'most fatal gift of classical art to modern times, as nine-tenths 'of the difficulties and clumsinesses of the revived art are 'owing to the introduction of this feature' (p. 42.). In the church of St. Andrew at Mantua, the piers are square masses faced with Corinthian pilasters—a mode of ornamentation on which Mr. Fergusson's opinion has been already cited. The church of Lodi is altogether more striking and more noteworthy. It is rightly said that 'this building is more truthful in its construction than any Gothic building we are acquainted with, there being no false roof or false construction of any sort' (p. 47.). But here again, 'the ornamentation consists almost wholly of ranges of pilasters which cover the walls both externally and internally, and by their small size and want of meaning detract much from what would otherwise be really a very beautiful design.' His judgment, in this instance, is almost too severe. The pilasters have much of the effect of mere arcading or panelling. But, whatever may be thought of the decoration, the spirit of the design is essentially Byzantine. As in the great church of Justinian, four semi-domes cluster round the cupola which soars above them. The only real difference is in the comparative height of the central dome. Otherwise it departs as little from the Byzantine idea as some of the Renaissance churches do from that of the Basilica. But many even of those buildings which exhibit classical detail in the greatest purity or with the most lavish abundance, betray the working of ideas which are not classical at all. The magnificent front of the Certosa at Pavia (p. 51.) may show the misapplication of ornamental forms which are fit only for internal use; but the front itself is one which could never have suggested itself to the merely classical student. The nave is divided from the aisles by massive buttresses. A bold triforium marks the separation of the pier-arches from the clerestory, while a large circular window over the central doorway calls for some tracery to complete the general resemblance to the front of a Gothic cathedral. A portion of the wall must, it is true, be set down as a sham: but it shares this fault with the western fronts of Exeter, Wells, Salisbury and Lincoln.

Still more striking, owing to its greater purity of detail, is the absence of a really classical character from the exquisite church

of the Annunciata at Genoa.\* Here no fragment of entablature is thrust between the Corinthian capital and the arch, while vertical lines run up from the former, and make the space between the stringcourse and the cornice practically a triforium. Over the whole rises a semicircular vault, divided longitudinally into three compartments, thus admitting the insertion of the windows 'as artistically as it could be done in the best Gothic 'vaults' (p. 80.). It may well be regretted that for the architects of St. Peter's at Rome such truthfulness of decoration had lost its charm. The masking of piers with flat pilasters, the insertion of heavy entablatures above the capitals, and the exaggeration of orders had become settled practices, before the great architects were summoned to the work which has produced the mightiest, if not the most beautiful church in Christendom. If it is difficult to criticise any building which is the result, not so much of genuine growth in art as of individual design, this difficulty is greatly increased in dealing with a structure with the dimensions of which no other can compete, and on which all that money and zeal could furnish has been lavished without stint or measure. In the eyes of some it is the proudest and most glorious achievement of all architecture; with others it is the crowning deformity of a degenerate art. But if we reject as worthless and absurd either of these extreme opinions, there is truth in the general admission, that the first impression on entering the building is one of disappointment. If many visits are needed to convince the stranger of the vast size of St. Peter's, while a single glance leaves the impression of enormous height in the cathedrals of Amiens, Beauvais or Cologne, there must be a reason for the difference. This reason may be found partly in the greater space occupied by the huge masses of the piers, as compared with the slender banded shafts of Gothic churches (a defect from which the plan of Bramante was comparatively free), but still more in the gigantic size of the internal order, which

'Required a corresponding exaggeration in every detail of the

\* The peculiarities of this building are simply the result of a departure from prevalent fashions. There is no real ground for doubting that it was built in the latter part of the seventeenth century; but the purity of its design furnishes Mr. Fergusson a powerful temptation to question the date. In the controversy about the church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, the same sort of argument was applied to show that the Golden Gateway could only have been built in the age of Constantine. See 'Ed. Rev.,' October 1860, p. 430.

church. The Baldacchino, for instance, over the altar rises to 100 feet in height, and has an order 62 feet high; but even with these dimensions it is hardly tall enough for its situation. But it is even worse with the sculptured details. The figures that fill the spandrels of the pier-arches throughout the church would, if standing upright, be 20 feet in height. The first impression they produce on looking at them is, that they are little more than life-size; and the scale they consequently give to the building is, that it is less than half the size it really is. When the mind has grasped their real dimensions, this feeling is succeeded by one almost of terror, lest they should fall out of their places—the support seems so inadequate to such masses; and what is worse, by that painful sense of vulgarity which is the inevitable result of all such exaggeration. The excessive dimension given to the order internally is, in fact, the key-note to all the defects which have been noticed in the interior of this church, and is far more essentially their cause than any other defect of design or detail.' (P. 64.)

This is strong censure: but the exterior draws forth criticisms still more severe. Round the whole building runs an enormous order of Corinthian pilasters which has 'dreadfully marred' the triapsidal arrangement to the west of the great dome,—an arrangement in itself one of 'the most beautiful that can be conceived.' These pilasters are 108 feet in height, from the base to the top of the cornice, and being surmounted by an attic of 39 feet, make up with the basement a wall 162 feet in height.

'Between these pilasters there are always, at least, two stories of windows, the dressings of which are generally in the most obtrusive and worst taste; and there is still a third story in the attic, all which added together make us feel more inclined to think that the architect has been designing a palace of several stories on a gigantic scale, and trying to give it dignity by making it look like a temple, rather than that what we see before us is really a great basilican hall degraded by the adoption of palatial architecture.' (P. 62.) Thus the 'world's greatest opportunity has been thrown away,' and 'the result has been a building which pretends to be classical, but which is essentially Gothic. It parades everywhere its classical details, but the mode in which they are applied is so essentially mediæval that nobody is deceived. We have two antagonistic principles warring for the mastery—the one Christian and real, the other sentimental and false; and in spite of all the talent bestowed upon it, it must be admitted that the failure is complete.' (P. 65.)

With this glorious, if not faultless, church, the great work of Sir Christopher Wren fitly challenges a comparison. From the existing Cathedral of St. Paul's his original design was in almost every particular different. It bore, in fact, a close resemblance to the Roman St. Peter's. There was the same

repetition round the whole building of exaggerated Corinthian pilasters, surmounted by an attic, with the same approximation in the plan to a Greek cross. Altogether, Mr. Fergusson is of opinion that the design of the present church is much to be preferred to that which it has displaced, while he believes that the arrangement of the earlier was better adapted for the purposes of a Protestant church. But he betrays a singular credulity or a curious misapprehension of the state of religious feeling in the seventeenth century, when he asserts that the change in plan 'was insisted upon by the Duke of York, who 'wanted a building more suited to the Catholic ritual than this 'church would have been; but more, perhaps, is due to that 'strange conservative feeling of the nation which made them 'spoil Inigo Jones's church in Covent Garden, in order that the 'altar might be at the east end, and which makes us now erect 'Gothic churches, not because they are either more beautiful 'or convenient than others that might be designed, but because 'our forefathers built in that manner' (p. 269.). The Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's had doubtless little sympathy with the Duke of York, but they had scarcely more agreement with the notions which in Mr. Fergusson's mind determine the idea of a Protestant church or a Protestant worship. This misapprehension would have been a matter of little moment, if it had not influenced his whole estimate of revived Gothic as compared with revived classical architecture. To this point we must hereafter revert, while for the present we may note the perfect accordance of the existing plan with that of the great English mediæval cathedrals. This agreement entailed the erection of nave and aisles with a clerestory, supported by buttresses which it became necessary to hide, because their appearance would not harmonise well with the spirit of Renaissance art. A wall was therefore built up to conceal them, and Mr. Fergusson cannot, of course, approve a construction which was a sham. Yet, with some little inconsistency, he proposes, by way of giving the repose and breadth which is now lacking to the lower story, to fill up the interval between the propylæa and the transept. It seems a costly sacrifice of truthfulness for the sake of hiding 'the windows in the 'pedestals of the upper niches' (p. 273.). How many buildings, raised while the art which we call Gothic was still growing, have windows let into the pedestals of niches?

Even on the dome, the distinctive glory of the great Renaissance churches, Mr. Fergusson's criticisms are severe, and perhaps a little inconsistent. Between the massive nave and the graceful choir of Ely rises its glorious octagon; over

the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople soars the still more glorious Byzantine cupola. But in the latter, the dome is the church; and the former exhibits externally no domical form at all. The application of the dome to the Latin Cross is a distinct achievement of the Renaissance architects. But if in this sense Mr. Fergusson is right in saying that to the Italians belongs exclusively the merit of inventing that class of domical churches of which St. Peter's at Rome is the typical example (p. 239.), there is no warrant for the assertion that the central dome itself was invented by them (p. 139.). The church of Lodi is little more than the reproduction of the Byzantine plan; and if the idea here followed had been faithfully worked out, we might have seen more splendid domes than those which crown St. Peter's at Rome and our own St. Paul's. Unfortunately, few examples of Renaissance domes exhibit any attempt at real truthfulness of construction. In this point the church of Lodi and the Liebfrauen Kirche of Dresden are unrivalled; but when Mr. Fergusson says that this is a merit which the latter shares with 'no other mediæval or modern church' (p. 333.), he must have forgotten that in his judgment the church of Lodi 'is more truthful in its construction than any Gothic building we are acquainted with' (p. 47.). Like the latter, however, the dome of the Liebfrauen Kirche is too high, and in place of supporting semi-domes, as at Lodi, it has subordinate turrets, which betray the working of Teutonic ideas. In fact, the whole design translates into Renaissance language the apsidal forms common to the Rhenish churches. Both, again, like the dome of St. Paul's, have the merit of showing their supports externally, and so of avoiding the fault which mars the grandeur of the dome of St. Peter's, the external effect of which 'is in a great measure lost, from its being placed in the centre of a great flat roof, so that its lower part can nowhere be properly seen, except at a distance; and it nowhere groups symmetrically with the rest of the architecture' (p. 62.). But the dome of St. Paul's is not without faults of its own. However splendid its form may be externally, the outer cupola is so far from representing the internal dome, that, in Mr. Fergusson's judgment, 'it would have been far better to have admitted at once that the external dome was, like the spires at Salisbury, Norwich, and elsewhere, merely an ornament of the exterior of the building, and then have arranged his interior wholly irrespective of its external form' (p. 272.). It is the natural result of employing wood and iron to raise a building to a height which in stone it was either difficult or impracticable to reach; but we



have some hesitation in admitting that a feature so essentially constructive can be fairly treated as a mere ornamental appendage.\* The form itself suggests a stone construction, and an impression of weakness is left on the mind, when, as at St. Paul's, the diameter of the dome is smaller than that of the colonnade beneath it. Of the other great domical churches which have been built in Europe during the last three centuries, there are none with merits which are not shared by some one or more of the examples already mentioned, while many of them (as the church of the Invalides and the Pantheon at Paris) exaggerate the difference between the external and internal vault. But in all alike, the vault is, in Mr. Fergusson's opinion, too high. In St. Peter's, it is not merely painful to look up at, but it dwarfs every other part of the church (p. 63.). In St. Paul's, the eye, looking along the aisles, never reaches beyond the great void of the dome, and fails to see that the little passage beyond is in fact a continuation of the aisle (p. 269.). In short, in all these buildings the dome is misplaced; and thus regarded, the dome of the Cathedral of Mexico is in better proportion to the rest of the church, where there is a chancel beyond. And thus his conclusion is that, 'if the dome ends the vista, it may be of any size, but in the middle of a cruciform church it throws every other part out of proportion, if its dimensions are not kept moderate' (p. 432.). In other words, the Renaissance architects have failed in adapting the dome perfectly to the Latin cross; and the octagon of Ely answers better to the cupola of Justinian than the domes of St. Peter's or St. Paul's.

It would be a curious and perhaps not an easy task, to determine the exact residuum of real merit which, in Mr. Fergusson's judgment, belongs to a style which, except in its earliest stage, exhibits only the genius, the wisdom, and the whims of individual architects. It has not achieved a complete success in applying the dome to the Latin cross; it has failed in working out a new idea, when it has dressed out Gothic towers and spires in a classical garb. It has erred in introducing pieces of entablature between piers and arches. It has used columns where they are not constructively necessary; and, finally, it has restricted itself to a scanty architectural apparatus,

---

\* No one, on viewing a Gothic church externally, could ever suppose that the spire covered a corresponding construction within the building; but the sight of an external dome must suggest to the eye a domical form for the interior. To treat the latter as a mere ornament is, therefore, a deception.

and applied to every conceivable purpose the only method of ornamentation which the canons of Vitruvius and Palladio left at its disposal. There may be instances in which the orders are gracefully applied, and produce a most pleasing effect, but the very application of them is generally unsuitable. In the church of the Invalides at Paris, it was necessary to save the dignity of the dome by cutting up the body of the building into two orders, and, by thus making it appear of two stories, to add 'one more to the numberless instances which prove how 'intractable the orders are when applied to modern purposes' (p. 173.). Recent designs of houses in Paris give some grounds for hoping that, although 'the orders are the only 'ready-made means of enriching a design of the present day' (p. 232.), we may now expect a change for the better. The defects of Vanbrugh's works arise chiefly from the fact that he 'had no idea of how to ornament a building, except by the 'introduction of an order, and to have had the greatest horror 'of placing one order over another' (p. 285.). The Radcliffe Library of Oxford is one of innumerable examples in which the order is made to include two or more ranges of windows, and the columns in the church of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, like those of Bramante's basilican church at Florence, exhibit the fragment of entablature between the capital and the arch (p. 288.).

But the problem was to become more complicated, and its results curiously perplexing. If in any cases the architects adhered scrupulously to truthful construction, there was some reason for thinking that their system might in time give birth to a new style. The church of Lodi seemed to give this promise for ecclesiastical, and the palaces of Genoa and Venice for secular architecture. But however grand and imposing may be the fronts of such buildings as the more celebrated palaces at Florence, we cannot fail of seeing that they belong to a period of transition, and that that period could be but brief. In their designs there is absolutely nothing to connect one stage with another. The horizontal tendency, which Mr. Fergusson claims as a distinguishing feature of classical art, has here indeed asserted its supremacy. But the engaged pillars of the Grimani palace at Venice, and the flat pilasters of the Rucellai at Florence, show the irresistible tendency to the universal employment of the order; and the introduction of vertical lines cutting the stringcourses led naturally, whether in ecclesiastical or secular designs, to the employment of orders, under which two or even more stories were comprised. In Italy, where the art of the Northern nations had never become naturalised, the

temptation to run into such false construction was not so powerful. The villa of Pope Julius (p. 107.), and the palace of Caprarola (p. 108.) near Rome, stand out in favourable contrast with the Museum, built by Michael Angelo, in the Capitol (p. 105.). At Milan, where the work of Teutonic architects could not be without its influence, the Great Hospital (p. 125.), with its magnificent quadrangle, is a Gothic building in a Renaissance dress which scarcely disguises its real character. In Spain, there was the same reluctance to adopt the spirit, together with the forms, of classical art. The piers of the Cathedral of Jaen (p. 155.) may be separated from the arch by a piece of entablature, but the character of the imposts and the clustered shafts is unmistakably Gothic. The court of the Archbishop's palace at Alcala de los Hernares (p. 148.), and the cloister in the monastery of Lupiana (p. 150.), are not less thoroughly Romanesque. They belong practically to the same stage of art with early Christian designs; nor is it easy to determine what is gained by thus returning to a point long since left behind. In truth, there was in Spain very little carefulness in the application of classical detail. The sombre but magnificent pile of the Escorial (p. 143.), exhibits a series of solecisms which would have shocked the disciples of Vignola and Palladio; but the whole design shows more of Gothic character than the masterpieces of Wren and Michael Angelo. But, this 'grandest and gloomiest failure of modern times,' with its forcible outlines and massive groupings, puts utterly to shame the miserable monotony of the still more modern palace of Madrid. In France the spirit of the national traditions was stronger than in Spain; and we have accordingly, in French buildings of every class, a more real adaptation of classical details to forms of which the use had become habitual. The west front of the cathedral at Dijon (p. 163.), and the church of St. Eustache, at Paris (p. 167.), are in their general structure so Gothic that they cannot be classed with pure Renaissance buildings. The chateaux still preserved the forms of feudal grandeur. In that of Chambord (p. 191.), which in its details can bear no severe criticism, the pilasters, as in the church of Lodi, are so employed as to give much of the effect of Gothic panelling, while the general character of the Bishop's palace at Sens (p. 196.), and of the house of Agnes Sorel at Orleans, is wholly alien to the forms employed in their decoration. But the age of Louis XIV. witnessed a greater modification of the old French plan; and such designs as the eastern façade of the Louvre (p. 214.), although by no means servile in their imitations, betray a tendency to adopt not merely the ornaments but integral features

of classical buildings. The portico, which was essential to a Roman temple, was stuck on to palaces and houses where it was constructively unnecessary and for all purposes useless. But for the full developement of this mistaken system we must look yet further North. The dwellings of the French nobles and gentry still preserved in no slight degree their ancient outlines, and the fashion of mere imitation never permanently affected their domestic architecture. In England, the resistance to the new style lasted longer than in France, but it was altogether more passive. 'The foundations of St. Peter's were laid a full century before we had a classical building of any kind in this country; and the Escorial and the Tuileries had been long inhabited before we thought it necessary to try to rival them' (p. 242.). But the new fashion, when once introduced, gained a wider and more undisputed sway. The Roman portico was transferred bodily by Inigo Jones into his design for the Duke of Devonshire's villa at Chiswick (p. 162.); and the example set here and in the house of Amresbury in Wiltshire (p. 264.), became the staple of the designs for English country-houses.

Whatever, then, may have been the cause, the Renaissance architects had neither in England nor elsewhere produced a new and living style. They had adapted and combined, in almost every possible form, the scanty materials which the canons of Vitruvius and Palladio had left at their disposal; and the comparative poverty of the result led naturally to a more complete devotion, not merely to classical details, but to genuine classical designs. It was easy to see that the Parthenon in its outlines, and in every feature, was faultless; it was not less obvious that its front, when transferred to the façade of a palace, altogether lost its charm. An almost unconscious feeling was springing up, that classical forms were deprived of their life when adapted to buildings of another character. The reaction was inevitable. Thus far houses and churches had presented the features of Greek or Roman art. The window, which had had its dripstone, now had its pilasters and pediment; the engaged column had taken the place of the buttress, and the prominent stringcourses had been superseded by entablatures. The fronts of larger buildings had been graced with colonnades or with porticoes, which might have served as entrances to heathen temples; but no one could mistake the buildings themselves for anything ancient. The proposed palace at Whitehall, the castles and houses of French kings and nobles, were utterly unlike anything that had been built by Greek or Roman architects. No one who looked on

Wren's steeple at Bow Church, or the Tower of the Seo at Zaragoza (p. 140.), could ever mistake them for buildings of an older style. The change which was promoted by the works of Wood and Stuart, still more perhaps by the acquisition of the Elgin Marbles, substituted a dead copying for a style which had shown some life, however feeble.

'Once the fashion was introduced, it became a mania. Thirty or forty years ago no building was complete without a Doric portico, hexastyle or octastyle, prostylar or distyle in antis; and no educated man dared to confess ignorance of a great many very hard words which then became fashionable. Churches were most afflicted in this way; next to these came gaols and country-halls—but even railway stations and panoramas found their best advertisements in these sacred adjuncts; and terraces and shop fronts thought they had attained the acme of elegance when either a wooden or plaster caricature of a Grecian order suggested the classical taste of the builder. In some instances the founders were willing to forego the commonplace requisites of light and air, in order to carry out their classical aspirations; but in nine cases out of ten a slight glance round the corner satisfies the spectator that the building is not erected to contain a statue of Jupiter or Minerva, and suffices to dispel any dread that it might be devoted to a revival of the impure worship of Heathen deities.' (P. 299.)

Mr. Fergusson's pleasant satire echoes somewhat faintly the biting sarcasms of Augustus Welby Pugin.

But if at first the inappropriateness of windows under a Greek colonnade was scarcely felt, the discovery of the solecism gave the spur to an imitation still more strict. The church of St. Pancras (p. 299.) may be a costly absurdity, but it is impossible to find fault with the details of St. George's Hall, at Liverpool, or to question the correctness of its design. Like the Bavarian Walhalla and the church of the Madeleine at Paris, it might have been built by Greeks or Romans two thousand years ago. Being an exact copy, the Walhalla must in one sense be as beautiful as the Parthenon; but it has not even the originality in the arrangement of parts, to which at the least St. George's Hall may fairly lay claim. In short, all these buildings, however beautiful or magnificent (and it is absurd to deny their elegance or splendour), are neither French, nor Bavarian, nor English. The more earnest the striving after correctness, the more serious must be the battle to hide the necessities of modern life. 'This has been nearly accomplished at St. George's Hall, but hardly anywhere else; and after all, supposing it successful, is this an aim worthy of the most truthful and mechanical of the arts?' (p. 309.)

The question applies with as much force to the Gothic revival as to the classical. But to the former Mr. Fergusson has applied the test with less than his usual fairness. In his hatred of all mere copying we heartily concur. Of the impossibility of any genuine invention in architecture as long as this system of imitation prevails, we are not less convinced than himself; but we cannot see why it should be more monstrous to copy in one dead language than another, or bring ourselves to think that the Teutonic forms are quite so dead for us as those which Vignola and Palladio consecrated with their canons. He has still farther departed from his general impartiality, by allowing religious or theological considerations to have weight in determining a question of art. The Walhalla and the Madelaine, although examples of direct imitation, never receive from him the crowning stigma which brands as forgeries the new church on the glacis of Vienna, or that of St. Nicolas at Hamburg. The feeling which has unconsciously prompted this distinction is closely connected with what we conceive to be his defective view of Gothic architecture in general. Until a genuine style comes into existence which shall be applicable to every building raised by every Englishman, without reference to his political or his religious creed, it is quite possible that one style may be more suitable for one class of structures than another.\* In

\* We can do no more than touch briefly on this, as on other questions of interest arising out of an examination of modern buildings. The subject of the appropriateness of styles for different purposes has been more fully discussed in an article on Public Monuments in a previous Number of this Review (April, 1862). It was there stated that, as a monument to the dead, no memorial could compete in beauty with the Eleanor Cross, or admit in an equal degree the application of sculpture and painting without the slightest traditional conventionality. We welcomed therefore with sincere pleasure the announcement that the memorial to the Prince Consort was to assume this form. When the idea of a monolithic obelisk was abandoned on account of its costliness, there remained the alternative of placing the statue of the Prince, habited in the garb of Pericles, within a Greek temple, or to represent him, as he really lived, on a monument of which the character might be strictly national. The former was felt to be intolerable; and it was no slight relief to think that a monument worthy of the Prince might at length be raised by the architect of the Martyrs' Memorial at Oxford. We confess our utter disappointment. The design is not an Eleanor Cross at all. Its character is purely Italian Gothic; and the shrine is in fact a gigantic exaggeration of the ciborium or tabernacle which frequently covers the Holy Sacrament in continental churches. As a monument, the idea would seem to be taken from the tomb of

either case it must of necessity be a question of adaptation or of copying. Whether we use Italian or Gothic designs and details, we are in either case speaking a language which is not really our own ; but where or in so far as it may be necessary to condemn, the measure in which either may be congenial to us must be the measure of our criticism. When the Italian architects consciously abandoned the details of Teutonic art, they deserved but little blame for casting aside architectural forms which they had never entirely made their own. The same indulgence should in all fairness be extended to those who in this country have reverted to the forms which are as congenial to us as ever the features of Roman art could be to Brunelleschi or Bramante. This Mr. Fergusson seems unable to see. For him a mediæval cathedral is the work of men who lived a long time ago, and from whom we are separated by a vast gulf in religion, thought, and feeling. He can only think of them as 'our ignorant and hardfisted forefathers' (p. 484.); nor can he believe it possible that an educated man can appreciate the English architecture of the Middle Ages, as he can that of republican Athens or imperial Rome. Anyone who is at once educated and impartial will thoroughly appreciate both ; but it is in the nature of things impossible that an Englishman should really feel the same patriotic enthusiasm for the latter, which it is at least possible that he may feel for the former. The Parthenon will bring to his mind the glorious age of Ictinus, of Phidias, and of Pericles. For the student of English history, the noblest works of our Teutonic architecture freshen the remembrance of that memorable century to which we owe all that essentially distinguishes our English constitution from even the most advanced in continental Europe. The

---

the Scaligers at Verona ; but the scale of the proposed structure is ludicrously exaggerated. The upper part is out of all proportion with the lower : and the height of the whole monument is dwarfed by the colossal statuary on the advanced pedestals. The result would be the same, if such sculpture were placed round an Eleanor Cross ; but a height of 150 feet is in itself as great an absurdity for this exaggerated Italian shrine as would be a height of 300 feet for an English cross. In all probability, the faults which strike us most in the design will be brought out still more painfully on the scanty site allotted to it, which leaves a clear space of only a few feet on each side of the monument. Whatever be the merit of an architectural design, the first condition of effect is that it should be adapted to the area in which it is to be placed, and to the points from which it can be seen. In all these respects, the erection of a Gothic tabernacle in one corner of Hyde Park is to be deprecated.

Roman ritualists of the present day have little more liking than Protestants for the endless vistas which open before us in the naves of York or Winchester. When, therefore, Mr. Fergusson speaks of St. Stephen's, Walbrook, as 'far more appropriate to Protestant worship than any of the Gothic designs 'recently erected' (p. 276.), he says what may be perfectly true, but it altogether begs the point in question. As a fact, during the whole existence of the English Church since the Reformation, there have been those who have adhered to a different idea, and we have no right to demand the general acceptance of our own notion of what may be suitable 'for the 'proper celebration of Divine worship in a Protestant community in the nineteenth century.' But this is precisely what Mr. Fergusson does, when he asserts that in the recent Gothic revival, chancels were thrown out simply for effect (p. 320.). He might have learnt that the chancel is no superfluous ornament in Mr. Hope's ideal of the nineteenth century cathedral; yet, with his characteristic inability to throw himself into forms of thought different from his own, he attributes to the younger Pugin a spirit of forgery, because for ecclesiastical buildings he wished to revive the general plan of mediæval churches. The insinuation is unfair; and no good can ever be done by forcing any part of this discussion into so false a channel. Mr. Fergusson in great part misapprehends his meaning, when he tells us that 'every page of Pugin's works reiterate, "Give us 'truth,—truth of materials, truth of construction, truth 'of ornamentation," &c. &c.; and yet his only aim was to 'produce an absolute falsehood. Had he ever succeeded to the 'extent his wildest dreams desired, he could only have produced 'so perfect a forgery that no one would have detected that a 'work of the nineteenth century was not one of the fourteenth 'or fifteenth' (p. 318.). So far as this charge is true, we have no wish to qualify it, or to make light of the hindrances which it puts in the way of any developement of genuine art. We will grant that the perfect Gothic church of Pugin or of Mr. Scott, might have been built in the Middle Ages. But we must be just. Mr. Fergusson has himself admitted that the Walhalla reproduces the Parthenon, and that anyone, judging from the exterior, might fairly set down the Madeleine at Paris as a work of the same age with the Maison Carrée at Nîmes, or the Erechtheion as belonging to the same period with St. George's Hall at Liverpool. If there is forgery in the one case, there is forgery also in the other. If it is absurd to make barometers and thermometers look like the works of the dark ages, long before 'those impostors Torcelli, or Galileo,



'or Newton are said to have invented them' (p. 328.), is it less absurd to put upon them ornaments which might make us fancy that they were invented in the days of Pericles or Julius Cæsar? To speak thus is to deal in useless exaggerations. Anyone who has read attentively the works of Pugin will see that in his demand for truth he was crying out mainly for truthfulness of construction and decoration. With him the plan of a church was not a subject for debate; it is not easy to see how from his point of view it could have been. The Renaissance architects had spread a taste for large halls and oratories; but the ritual of the Roman Church had never varied, and with the continuance of the same wants it seemed illogical to infer the necessity of different arrangements. What Pugin resisted with all his energy was that system of false construction and ornamentation which no one else has condemned with greater vehemence than Mr. Fergusson. It was ludicrously false to place buttresses and crockets on chairs and tables, or to make the butler clean his plate in a bastion. It was in Pugin's eyes scarcely less false to make up a tower, as at St. Pancras, by placing one Temple of the Winds on the top of another, or to produce a steeple, as Wren did at Bow Church, by plagiarising every form of a Gothic tower and spire, and translating them into the Renaissance dialect. If he could see little merit or originality in substituting a balustrade for an open parapet, and an obelisk in place of a pinnacle, it needs some assurance to say that he was wrong.

In truth, with all his correctness of taste, Mr. Fergusson has in this volume chiefly laid himself open to charges of inconsistency. It could hardly be otherwise. In his own words, it is 'difficult to write calmly and dispassionately 'in the midst of the clamour of contending parties, and not to 'be hurried into opposition by the unreasoning theories that 'are propounded on both sides' (p. 242.). Hence, perhaps, it was to be expected that he should impute especially to the Gothic revivalists that vice of applying ornamentation without thought which he had previously (pp. 22-48, &c.), denounced as the 'inherent tendency,' or rather 'the bane,' of the Renaissance styles. It may be true that 'in using the classical style, it 'required the utmost skill and endless thought to make the 'parts, or details, adapt themselves even moderately well to 'the purposes of Modern Church Architecture' (p. 319.): but as a fact, this thought had rarely, perhaps never, been bestowed on the subject. When the Renaissance architects availed themselves of pillars and pilasters, 'their real recommendation was that they covered the greatest amount of

‘space with the least amount of thought’ (p. 48.). But it is a mere assumption to tell us that one of the most important advantages of the Gothic style is its cheapness. ‘In a Gothic building, the masonry cannot be too coarse, or the materials too common. The carpentry must be as rude and as unmechanically put together as possible; the glazing as clumsy, and the glass as bad as can be found’ (p. 319.). The charge is curious when applied to Gothic, as distinguished from a style which, except in actual paintings, allows no treatment which is not conventional. The rules of the great Renaissance architects have stereotyped the forms of capitals, entablatures, and cornices; but the sculptured foliage of Cologne Cathedral is faulty, as being far too natural. With ourselves, it seems to be for the present a question of adaptation or copying, whether the forms chosen are classical or Gothic. We do not deny the beauty of St. Paul’s Cathedral, we are not blind to the demerits (such as they are) of the Palace of Westminster. The British Museum may be a finer building than the museum recently completed by the University of Oxford. But while Mr. Fergusson minutely criticises the Houses of Parliament and the Oxford Museum, he omits (it would almost seem of set purpose) to notice a large number of buildings which really belong to another class. He can scarcely be too severe on the spasmodic straining after every imaginable eccentricity which is betrayed by such designs as those of All Saints’, Margaret Street, or the chapel of Balliol College, Oxford. But buildings which appear studiously to avoid every English form must not make us forget that the works of Mr. Scott are in general examples of purely Teutonic art. It would be absurd to suppose that he has invented any new style, and perhaps presumptuous to imagine that his designs may lead directly to any such development. But none who examine the chapel of Exeter College, Oxford, will discover there either falsity of construction or misapplication of ornament, while all will see (what no Renaissance design can exhibit) capitals and corbels, brackets and bosses, of which no one example is like another, and all of which were patiently worked out on the spot by the artist who had before him the living foliage of nature. If the careful and earnest elaboration of details is likely to lead hereafter to a better condition of art, then Mr. Scott has contributed more than any other living man to the result so eagerly desired by Mr. Fergusson.

Conventionality is, indeed, no essential characteristic of the architecture of Teutonic Christendom. The foliage which graces its piers and arches may be strictly natural. The drawings which fill its windows may, and ought to be, as true as those of Benjamin

West or Sir Joshua Reynolds.\* The spandrils of the choir arches of Cologne have furnished as fair a field for the frescoes of Deger as the basilicas of Bramante could afford to the painters of Italy. But it is useless to specify its capabilities if the whole system of modern Gothic design is condemned, and perhaps rightly condemned, already. Mr. Fergusson will have no copying whether Gothic or classical:—

‘For the philosophical student of art it is of the least possible consequence which may now be most successful in encroaching on the domains of its antagonist. He knows that both are wrong, and that neither can, consequently, advance the cause of true art. His one hope lies in the knowledge that there is a *tertium quid*, a style which, for want of a better name, is sometimes called the Italian, but should be called the common-sense style. This never having attained the completeness which debars all further progress, as was the case in the purely classical or in the perfected Gothic styles, not only admits of, but insists on, progress. It courts borrowing principles and forms from either. It can use either pillars or pinnacles, as may be required. It admits of towers and spires, or domes. It can either indulge in plain walls, or pierce them with innumerable windows. It knows no guide but common sense; it owns no master but true taste. It may hardly be possible, however, because it requires the exercise of these qualities; and more than this, it demands thought, where copying has hitherto sufficed; and it courts originality, which the present system repudiates. Its greatest merit is that it admits of that progress, by which alone man has hitherto accomplished anything great or good either in literature, in science, or in art.’ (P. 529.)

There is an apparent clearness and a very real obscurity about this singular passage. What is this Italian or common-sense style? If it means nothing more than the employment of certain constructive forms, it scarcely deserves the name of a style at all. If it implies the use of Italian decorative features, it becomes again a mere question of adaptation. We cannot escape from the magic circle; and, although it is quite possible that a new style may be developed from the use of Italian forms, it is not less possible that the same result may be attained by employing an ornamentation which is not Italian. If, however, we may judge from any existing works, we should be loth to yield to this Italian style the credit of all those powers which Mr. Fergusson claims for it. For pinnacles it has given

---

\* The designs of the Munich glass can scarcely be condemned on the score of conventional drawing. But few who have compared the windows in the southern aisle of the nave of Cologne Cathedral with those of the choir will defend the theory which makes the picture independent of the mullions and tracery of the window.

us obelisks, or forms still more nondescript; for towers it has piled one triumphal arch on another; for spires, it presents a series of pilastered octagons with bulbous buttresses. It may have windows; but these are mere apertures. Of tracery, so long as the style remains Italian at all, it seems to be utterly incapable. Vast semicircles yawn under the vault of the 'Invalides' Church at Paris; and in place of the exquisite rose windows of Amiens or Westminster, a huge eye, hollow as the socket of the blinded Polyphemus, stares out from the front of the Certosa at Pavia (p. 51.). It may raise domes; but these are in idea Byzantine; and the octagon of Ely approaches nearer to this idea than any Renaissance example. In short, unless we confine ourselves to absolutely naked construction, we must, whether with one form or another, commence with adaptation; and we thus reach the simple conclusion that Mr. Fergusson prefers the language of Greece and Italy to that of England.\*

Still, to the adaptation of what are called Gothic forms, there remains an objection more serious than any which Mr. Fergusson has specified. From the first dawn of Roman architecture down to the time when Teutonic art yielded to the inroads of the Renaissance, every stage is a link in a series of continuous and inseparable developments. To adopt any one stage as our starting-point is to make an arbitrary selection without any regard to its philosophical connexion with all that went before or followed it. When the builders of the early basilicas cast aside the entablature, it was an honest return to the architecture of Rome; and a genuine arched construction inevitably suggested the relation of the arcades to the parts above them. The perception of this relation led as inevitably to the employment of the pointed arch. Within each bay the windows, which had been mere openings let into the wall without system, fell into groups, whose tracery followed precisely

---

\* Nothing can more clearly show that Mr. Fergusson has not thrown himself as thoroughly into the spirit of Gothic as of other architecture, than the assertion that, 'in so far as the system of ornamentation is concerned, the Saracenic style is identical with the Gothic. Both use pointed arches, clustered piers, vaulted roofs, and they claim other features in common.' (P. 416.) It would be true to say that they exhibit some likeness in details of ornament; but the Saracenic system of mere surface decoration is utterly alien to the subordination of the Gothic; nor is it too much to say that if the Romanesque styles had started with the decorative system of Saracenic art, Gothic architecture could never have come into existence.

the same laws which regulated every other part of the design. The transition from a subordination of distinct parts to a fusion in which all parts were merged, may be traced as clearly in the one as in the other. And when the continuous styles succeeded to the geometrical, the principle which had produced all these developements was completely exhausted, and the victory of any invading style assured. Nor can the significance of this fact on the future history of the art be well over-rated. If we assume with Mr. Scott, that we may build in the style of the Ste. Chapelle at Paris, and if we are not to go on so copying and building for ever, in what is our work to issue? Is any new application of its principles practicable, or even conceivable? If we cannot see our way to an affirmative answer, it may be no reason for resorting to the common-sense Italian style; but it is a grave reason for not making arbitrary selections from a series which is philosophically complete, and whose principles have been thoroughly worked out.

Nor does this remark apply with less force to the Italian style, unless it be taken to mean nothing more than the use of the pier and arch without reference to Greek or Roman details. This, however, is to revert to mere naked construction\*; and possibly under no other conditions can the rise of a genuine style be looked for. If thus, or in any other way, a really living architecture should spring up, it must be one which will be applicable to all buildings whatsoever. It will be as suitable for the synagogues of Jews as for the churches of Christians, for commercial storehouses as for royal palaces. There will no longer be any question of the appropriateness of different styles for different purposes. There will be no need to discuss whether a church should be Gothic, or a club-house classical. It will suit every want, ecclesiastical or secular, of our age, not less than the style which we call Gothic met the needs of our forefathers. In a greater degree it could not do so; and much of the perplexity and absurdity of our present practice arises from our failing to see how marvellously flexible that architecture was. Because Englishmen in the fifteenth century built houses with narrow mullioned windows, the same thing is done now, and the cry is raised that Gothic is inconvenient for

---

\* Mr. Fergusson has, indeed, reduced the question within a very narrow compass. If all copying of ornamental forms is utterly condemned, we can but do one of two things. We may use the column with the round arch, or the column with the pointed arch. In the one case we take up the Romanesque, in the other we adopt the Gothic principle; and still more it may be urged that the former, if taken as the starting-point, must lead on to the latter.

domestic buildings. The truth is, they had what they wished to have. If there had been need of wider openings, they would have pierced them as wide as any that are now filled with plate glass. The idea is but of recent growth that the purpose of a window is not merely to let in light, but to give as wide a view as possible of the landscape without. For those who adopt this idea, a genuine architecture will provide what is wanted as readily with Gothic as with Greek or Renaissance forms.

We can do no more than touch on this point of practical interest, which involves the whole question of domestic architecture; nor can we enter on the ethnological discussions with which Mr. Fergusson brings his work to a close. There is the less need to do so, because we do not profess to have any deeper knowledge of Pelasgians and Turanians than Mr. Grote or Sir Cornewall Lewis. Here, as in his former work, Mr. Fergusson dogmatizes, where they are silent, and he has seen reason to attribute to the primitive Aryans a belief the very reverse of that which seems to be indicated in their mythology. These, however, are matters of less moment than the practical questions with which the future progress of architecture is bound up. If in treating these questions Mr. Fergusson has not been altogether consistent or impartial, he has examined them with a fullness and a force which commands our gratitude. If we have differed from him on some points, we have agreed with him on more; and we gladly express our hope and our belief that his labour will not be in vain.

- ART. IV.—1. *Histoire de la Révolution Française*. Par M. LOUIS BLANC. 12 vols. Paris: 1847–62.
2. *Histoire de la Terreur, 1792–4, d'après des documens authentiques et inédits*. Par M. MORTIMER-TERNAUX. 2 vols. Paris: 1862.

BY the publication of the twelfth and concluding volume of his '*Histoire de la Révolution Française*' (the first of which appeared in 1847), M. Louis Blanc has now completed his chosen labour of many years. Never, perhaps, has a great literary undertaking been conceived, proceeded with, and executed, under circumstances so various and so singular. When first he addressed himself to the subject, he was a young and almost unknown literary man, an unit among the many thousand

ardent spirits of Paris who were urging on their own destiny and that of the State towards the great abyss which, like Bossuet's precipice, lay before them, without possibility of return. Guizot was then Prime Minister of France; Louis Philippe was apparently at the height of his power; the question of farther progress towards democracy seemed, for the moment, adjourned; or rather, a stationary period had intervened between the perpetual oscillations of flux and reflux in that agitated society. But when his first two volumes appeared, the air was already dark with the signs of an approaching catastrophe. Then came the crash, and the unknown author was himself elevated, by one of the strangest of Fortune's sports, into the position of an arbiter of the fortunes of that great community whose former revolutionary struggles he was engaged in depicting. How the man of a 'rare mais âpre fanatisme,' as Lamartine designates him, comported himself in that hour of giddy elevation, future historians will have to say, for the tale of 1848 has not yet been told. Driven into exile, he resumed his pen after a few years; the next volumes appeared in 1852, under the shadow of nascent Imperialism, the last in 1862, after ten years of that system have pruned down to the very root the luxuriance of liberal sentiment, and left the memories of Republicanism and of Parliamentary government alike to the keeping of an elderly generation. These ten years the author has spent in exile. And there is something both of dignity and of good sense in the manner in which that bitter trial has been borne, which commends him to the sympathy of the reader. Faithful to his principles—erroneous as most deem them, fanatical as most deem his addiction to them—he has never appeared to despair of their success, and of the regeneration of France through their means. But he has held them usually in calm reserve; never gone out of his way to obtrude them, or himself in conjunction with them, on public notice; never joined, so far as we are aware, in the schemes of those successive conspirators who have at times rendered the maintenance of our ancient right of political asylum a matter of no small difficulty; never vented his passions in ignoble abuse of hostile power from a safe distance. Among us he has lived as one of ourselves, cherishing political principles in utter discordance with those which prevail with the majority here—not disguising, but not obtruding them; never endeavouring to use for his own personal purposes the popularity which those principles might have earned him with a zealous minority; never compromising his own dignity, either by noisy complaint or boastings, but quietly defending his conduct and

principles when personally attacked, and leaving the ultimate issue of his cause in the hands of Time.

Thus much we have allowed ourselves to say ; for there is no trial of temper and of personal dignity more searching than that of long obscure political exile, and he who has borne it well deserves the tribute of respect, however little we may approve his political conduct. As far as the purposes of the present work are concerned, this exile, which at first seemed likely to prevent altogether the completion of the present work, turned out, singularly enough, of the greatest possible advantage to the author. Deprived of the resources of the public and private libraries of his own country, his residence here introduced him to those possessed by the British Museum. What he found there, and how he used it, is described in the preface to his seventh volume, published in 1855. 'J'ai de grandes actions de grâce à rendre à mon exil,' he says, 'qui m'a mis en état d'approfondir mon sujet beaucoup mieux que je ne l'aurais pu à Paris même.' The late Mr. Croker was an insatiable collector of pamphlets, newspapers, records of every sort, respecting the first French Revolution ; and on two different occasions (unless we are misinformed) he parted with all which he possessed in this way to the British Museum.\* These masses of matter, being added to the collections made and stored by the establish-

\* To give some idea of its value and extent, we quote the description which Louis Blanc himself has left on record of it in the 'Avis au Lecteur' which precedes his seventh volume :—

'En relations contemporaines, brochures pour ou contre, discours, rapports, pamphlets, satires, chansons, statistiques, portraits, procès-verbaux, proclamations, placards, &c., &c., le catalogue comprend : sur la seule affaire du Collier, 3 énormes dossiers ; sur les Parlements, 6 ; sur les États-Généraux, 75 ; sur la Noblesse, 3 ; sur le Clergé, 86 ; sur les Travaux Publics pendant la Révolution, 7 ; sur le Commerce, 3 ; sur l'Agriculture, 2 ; sur les Clubs, 22 ; sur les Fêtes Civiques, 9 ; sur la Police des Cultes, 62 ; sur les Poids et Mesures, 1 ; sur les Sciences pendant la Révolution, 3 ; sur la Garde Nationale, 3 ; sur les Sections de Paris, 5 ; sur l'Éducation, 9 ; sur la Philosophie, 16 ; sur les Monuments Publics, 3 ; sur les Émigrés, 28 ; sur les Colonies, 45 ; sur la Mendicité et les Hospices, 4 ; sur les Prisons, 5 ; sur Robespierre, 12 ; sur Camille Desmoulins, 13 ; sur Brissot, 5 ; sur Marat, 13 ; sur Babeuf, 10 ; et ainsi de suite. . . . Inutile d'ajouter qu'à chaque événement notable de la Révolution correspond une masse de documents proportionnés à son importance. C'est ainsi, par exemple, que l'ensemble des pièces diverses relatives aux affaires d'Avignon va du n° 591 au n° 599. Quant aux histoires proprement dites, la collection s'étend du numéro 1208 au numéro 1340 !'



ment and by George III. during the period of the Revolution itself, complete the unrivalled repository of which Louis Blanc speaks.

By the aid of these means, envied by his French critics themselves, and with his literary ability sharpened by political experience, M. Louis Blanc has produced a work of a very high order. But a History, in the highest sense of all, we dare not call it. It is in truth another contribution to that series of eloquent and voluminous essays, framed on preconceived ideas, which their authors have entitled Histories of the French Revolution. Its peculiar merit lies in the unity of thought and purpose which prevails throughout the whole. The casual reader, who will merely take it up to peruse his account of particular scenes and characters, though he may find much to interest and strike him, will not be able to appreciate this its highest characteristic—the mode in which the sequence of facts is brought powerfully and distinctly out; in which it is shown how each mistake, each injustice committed by the several parties, as well as each bold and successful political stroke, depended on its antecedent, and produced its results; how one day was the father of another, and each incident only to be understood by close advertence to that which preceded and followed it. This is Louis Blanc's greatest achievement; and, for historical purposes, it is one of no common order. And it exhibits itself, very markedly, in the dramatic part of his work, in the delineation of character. It has been said that Shakespeare differs from almost all other dramatists essentially in this, that his characters are not figures introduced complete into the canvas; they alter, grow, and develop under the eye. So it is, in due proportion, with the personages brought forward in the pages of Louis Blanc. Unlike most French writers of equal power, he does not seem to us to excel in the artistic finishing of elaborate portraits, where he attempts it. But his characters draw themselves. Mirabeau, Brissot, Robespierre, Saint-Just, seem to grow out of their indistinct beginnings into definite individualities, chapter by chapter, and to assume by degrees, as they did in life, their due proportion to the scene which they fill.

It is evident how considerable, and rightly so, are the advantages which the historian who deals with a great work in this complete way has over those who exercise their ingenuity on the production of 'monographs,' as some term them—historical essays on special subjects, characters, or scenes, forming portions of the great whole. We have been much struck with this circumstance, when comparing the history

before us with the recent special works of anti-revolutionary writers who have obtained success in France, and in some instances deservedly; Granier de Cassagnac ('*Histoire des Girondins*'), and the more solid, but not less one-sided, De Barante ('*Histoire de la Convention*'). We must add to these the work of M. Mortimer-Ternaux, which we have named at the head of this article. Although full of valuable and hitherto unknown or unappreciated materials, it comprises, at present, merely the history of Paris during the three summer months of 1792. Its chief merit consists in the large amount of original written evidence it has brought to light, M. Mortimer-Ternaux having had the patience to disinter and examine several hundred thousand documents and entries of the time, which in many cases correct the loose statements of contemporary narrative by irrefragable evidence. The impartial reader will no doubt often agree with the corrections which these authorities make in the facts, and the disproof which they administer to the theories, of our republican. But their accounts of each particular crisis and action seem mutilated by the want of 'suite'—the want of that connexion with things before and after, which he on his part traces with such clearness and ability. Conduct which seems absurd, or ignoble, or inconsequent, becomes often intelligible and in a sense justifiable by comparison with some other and distant series of facts.

We have in our time felt indignant with Barnave and the Jacobins of 1791, for their spiteful detraction of their own great leader Mirabeau, who had set in movement that Revolution by which they lived; we now know clearly, what they doubtless knew darkly, that Mirabeau had sold the Revolution and them to the Court, through ascertained brokers, for ready money. We have probably judged according to preconceived opinions that passage in the life of Robespierre, where, in the beginning of 1792, he sets himself with all his force to oppose the declaration of war against the Coalition; contrary to the views of all the various sections of the friends of liberty, and in contradiction also to the expressed and enthusiastic feeling of the country.\* We may have attributed it to personal jealousy of opposite leaders—to a sense of his own civil importance, which a state of war would nullify—to fear of the extinguishment of liberty by military chiefs, and so forth. We now know that whatever effect these secondary

---

\* This passage of history is treated with great force—allowing for his partisanship wherever Robespierre is concerned—by Louis Blanc, vol. vi. chap. 7.

causes may have had, Robespierre was in his own sense perfectly right, and the more impulsive liberals were deceived; that the Court and a portion of the constitutionalists actually entertained the intention of using that war, and the military force which it would call out, for the direct purpose of counter-revolution. We have all read, perhaps with admiration, but most of us certainly with some disgust, Vergniaud's famous apostrophe to his outraged, impotent sovereign, in daily peril of liberty and life:—‘Tu n'es plus rien pour ce peuple que tu as si lâchement trahi,’ and so forth; and may have deemed it, as M. Ternaux would still apparently have us deem it, a piece of cruel rhetorical pedantry, a base attempt to earn popularity by appealing to the worst feelings of the mob. But Time, the great rectifier, has revealed to us what Vergniaud knew well enough in a general way, though he could not prove it as we can—that in that very month of July, 1792, the King's agent, Mallet du Pan, was haunting the doors of the ministers of Austria and Prussia at Frankfort, with the King's own propositions, inviting their masters to march to Paris in order to save the monarchy. And thus it is that in judging either a man or a cause by insulated facts or expressions occurring in the course of a career, one is almost inevitably unjust; and this is the peculiar injustice which the study of special portions of history, otherwise so attractive, is calculated to promote, the study of connected and elaborate histories calculated to correct.

But if calculated to correct this error, it is unfortunately calculated to involve the mind of the reader in far more binding and durable error, unless he is fortified by that amount of scepticism which only the cooling of the passions and the slow acquisition of much knowledge produce in some, and which no discipline seems to produce in others. ‘L'histoire de la Révolution,’ Louis Blanc over and over again declares to us, ‘est encore à faire.’ The era for impartial history, that is, has not yet begun. And his own work certainly furnishes no exception. It is a remarkable achievement: but no more a history, in the higher sense, than those of Thiers, or Michelet, or Lacretelle, or Montgaillard. It is, from beginning to end, simply an advocate's defence of a client. The causes of revolution against conservatism, of the popular party against the Court, of the Jacobins against the Feuillans, the Mountain against the Gironde, Robespierre against Danton and against the Committees, and his disciples against the ‘Thermidorians’—these are the causes, or rather the successive phases of the same cause, to the establishment of which he devotes himself

assiduously, pertinaciously, without yielding and remorse, without a single looking back, with hardly a single deviation into the vice of candour. He may, indeed, blame and inveigh against the excesses of his friends; but he never admits that they were wrong as against their immediate opponents. In general, his object is sufficiently attained by a bold and lucid developement of the case which he wishes to make, honestly exposing its weak side but arguing with all his force in favour of its strong. But he is by no means above the more ordinary arts of the advocate. This is especially manifest where he has to deal with what in modern phrase we must call the 'sensation' portions of his subject. It is never his tendency to slur over, or to colour in undertone, the horrors which he has to depict: his own thorough love of humanity, his tendency to take on all occasions the weaker side, preserve him sufficiently from all such temptation. But having faithfully brought out the dark side of his picture, he hurries to dart in as many patches of light—often with very little authentication—as the subject will admit of. He does not soften the crimes of the revolutionary tribunals, of the chief agents of Terror, or of the 'men of September;' but he brings into as much prominence as he can their fits of human weakness, their acquittals, their connivances at escape. In the same style of pleading—and it is an employment of it which we more regret—heroic acts, or personages, on the wrong side, are not indeed suppressed, but all that can be said in detraction of them is brought forward with a judicial air. Louis XVI. died a martyr, no doubt—in his own cause—but he lost his patience, was noisy, and struggled with his executioners. Charlotte Corday was a heroine, but she had a certain 'légèreté de caractère;' was by no means free from affectation, had a 'préoccupation de gloire toute payenne,' and was not particular about truth\*; and, though descended from the great Corneille, she was not perfect in her spelling. But the more effective

---

\* Nothing is more unjust, at times, than a minute dissection of words. Charlotte Corday admitted that she left Caen with the design of killing Marat. Nevertheless, she says in her letter to Barbaroux that Marat's threats, in his conversation with her, to have the Girondins sent to the scaffold, 'ont décidé de son sort.' Louis Blanc thinks it worth his while to quarrel with this contradiction as indicating a want of truthfulness. Who cannot reconcile the two statements in the mouth of a determined but impulsive girl? M. Vatel, in his curious republication of the '*Dossiers du Procès de Charlotte Corday*,' seems to make out that this letter to Barbaroux was written at intervals and in fragments.

and more constant artifice which he employs is that of carefully constructed parallels of crime. On each several occasion he applies himself to show, not by argument so much as by effective juxtaposition, how the misdeeds of his clients were occasioned, or paralleled, or avenged by those of their enemies. The early excesses of the Revolution are shown as nearly as may be in the same light with the occasional violence of the clerical faction, with the bloodshed of Nancy and of the Champ de Mars; the tale of Lyons, Avignon, Toulon, Nantes, ingeniously intermingled with accounts of the ferocity exhibited by Catholics in the South, and Vendéans in the West; and the tragedy of La Terreur itself immediately followed by a special and most vigorous chapter, in his last volume, headed 'La Terreur Blanche:' a chapter which deserves to produce great effect, and would be calculated to produce more, could not the experienced eye detect thus much,—that though the author rarely hazards a statement without authority, he relies, when Royalists are to be accused, on such slight authorities as he would demolish with the most merciless criticism if they had been adduced against Republicans. And, in truth; with regard to many of the leading events of the Revolution, the art of the advocate lies neither in inventing nor concealing, but simply in giving his own turn and colour to well-known materials. 'Tout est optique,' says Mercier, in one of the most frequently quoted passages of his 'Nouveau Paris' (a work, by the way, which, after having reposed in peace for many years on the shelves of *bouquinistes*, has lately acquired a certain fashion as an authority), everything depends on the point of view from which we regard it. Compare the narrative of the popular intrusion into the Tuileries on the 20th of June, 1792, as given by Louis Blanc and by Mortimer-Ternaux: each uses the same materials, and uses them honestly, and yet how entirely opposite are the impressions conveyed by the one narrative and the other! Or compare the account given by Louis Blanc of the return from Varennes with that which, unluckily for the austere Pétion, Mortimer-Ternaux has disinterred from that patriot's papers, and printed in the appendix to his first volume. None of the facts are materially different; but under how different a colour they appear to the Republican writer, who gently rebukes the shade of Pétion for having exhibited to the royal captives a little too much of patriotic austerity, and acted the 'paysan du Danube' in too marked a manner, and to us, who are now in possession of the secret, that Pétion had the ineffable coxcombry to imagine Madame Elisabeth in love with him, and dreaded, in the close

and protracted contact of that travelling-carriage, to have his virtue compromised by a premature declaration from Her Royal Highness!

But having expressed our opinion of M. Louis Blanc's intense partisanship, we must hasten to say that we hold him to be one of those advocates whose entire mind is coloured and absorbed by the cause to which they have devoted themselves. From the vulgar trickery of misstating facts, of inventing friendly or concealing hostile authorities, he is, so far as we have observed, entirely exempt. We have been constantly struck with his boldness, not only in referring to authorities, but in citing them, where, to our comprehension, they seem to contradict his conclusions and reduce to absurdity his theories. Others have written as philosophers, patronising the people from a serene distance; he is 'le peuple' himself—not so much an adherent of the popular side as the very incarnation of so-called popular views and doctrines. If we can conceive the people (using the word as our neighbours do, to signify at once something opposed to the higher classes and the bourgeoisie, and something distinct from the nation at large) engaged in the task of recording its own great Saturnalia by the hand of its own confidential secretary, these volumes might be the result, and Louis Blanc the instrument.

In nothing has this essentially popular kind of temperament more forcibly struck us, than in the strange credulity which he exhibits as to all rumours of that class which are sure to have currency with minds heated by party and in periods of storms, though they usually lose it again, in the minds of reasonable men, as soon as the storms subside. Critical to excess in exposing fictions of hostile import, there is nothing he does not seem prepared to receive as an article either of faith or of serious suspicion, when it tallies with the course of his theories. He believes that Ganganelli was murdered by the Jesuits. He very much inclines to believe that Mirabeau was poisoned—and the Emperor Leopold. He believes that Gamain, the locksmith, was poisoned; not, he says, by the King or Queen—but who else could have done it? He believes that Desault the physician, and Chopart the chemist, who were the last to minister to the supposed Dauphin in the Temple, were both poisoned by the Government. He believes that the Count de Provence (Louis XVIII.) was throughout the Revolution intriguing against the King—that 'il usa de sa position, de son influence, de son crédit, dans un sens à la fois funeste à son frère aîné et favorable à lui-même' (ii. 161.); that he systematically calumniated the Queen; that he got rid of his nephew, the unfortu-

nate Dauphin. He believes, apparently, in the scandal of the 'Collier;' the conspiracy of Favras (iii. 404.), that of Maillebois (iv. 189.). His faith is potent in all the charges thrown out of underhand devices for ruining the Revolution by making it unpopular; in 'unknown men cutting open sacks of flour with 'their knives,' in order to enrage the populace; in the bands of 'well-mounted and well-dressed' counter-revolutionists, who went about in the autumn of 1789 encouraging the peasants to destroy the châteaux (iv. 53.); in the legendary pair of Englishmen who were seen drinking, and prompting the massacres, at the prison of the Abbaye (vii. 167.). He execrates the 'commerce assassin' of 'accapareurs' (forestallers, as our ancestors called them) to the very top of the popular bent against them; believes that they murdered Pinet (ii. 472.) for denouncing them; that in 1792, 'in order to ruin the manufactures, to leave the workmen idle and force them to curse the Revolution,' they 'monopolised everything,—yea, everything, down to paper, roofing slates, and pins' (vi. 274.); that the counter-revolutionary capitalists systematically 'refused work' to the people (to their own ruin) with the same dark object; that landlords forbore to ask for their rents when due, in order that farmers might hold back their corn instead of selling it, and so starve the populace into discontent (x. 403.). We by no means place all these instances of credulity, to which many similar might be added, on the same footing; some are cases in which reasonable suspicion might well be entertained, others appear to our judgment mere midsummer madness; but we array them together as affording proof of that robust superabundance of faith which is so eminently characteristic of the vulgar mind everywhere, and of those peculiar minds which, like Louis Blanc's, though critically and even fastidiously polished, retain at bottom the instincts, the reasoning, the sentiments of the multitude.

As might be suspected, a mind so tenacious of the old revolutionary suspicions finds ample food in the dark machinations of England, or at least of the British Government. 'Pitt et 'Cobourg' scarcely played a more monstrous part in Barrère's 'Carmagnoles,' than in the sober pages of our historian. This is really hard upon us; for Louis Blanc can be both just and generous towards us. Of our people, and of our institutions, founded though these are on principles entirely opposed to his own, he speaks with uniform respect; he fully appreciates what we esteem our good qualities, and shows even more than due indulgence to our failings; and, which is still rarer with his countrymen, is at once acute and merciful in his judgments on our public men. And yet he appears actuated throughout by

the belief that Pitt, his Government, and his Parliaments, were inspired by the very genius of Machiavel himself, throughout their dealings with the ingenuous patriots of the Revolution. He cannot make the allowance for the natural hesitations of a free Government, embarrassed by a persevering opposition, but sets down every apparent inconsistency to some deep, if inexplicable, manœuvre. He cannot see that for many years of the struggle England had no idea whatever of seeking to reestablish Royalist government in France, simply because to impose any government on a foreign nation through war was contrary to English ideas; that we fought France to conquer France if we could, regardless of the form of government which France might afterwards assume, except so far as the security of peace might seem to require. He persists in supposing that the reluctance of England to dictate political lessons to the Vendéans, or to interfere in behalf of the royal family, was simply the dark calculation of minds bent on seeing France perish by the mutual violence of her sons, and anxious to prolong her agony as far as possible through a specious, but designing, forbearance.\*

---

\* We place together in a note two curious instances of the very loose assertions into which Louis Blanc's prejudice against Pitt and his associates occasionally hurries him.

1. In 1790 England was embracing strongly the party of the Stadtholder against the democrats in the United Provinces. The English Minister, Lord Harris, writes home:—"If this" (an insurrection in favour of the Stadtholder) "should not happen, we might then look forward to the reduction of this country to a state of insignificance 'as the best event which can befall England.' This our author renders as follows:—"S'il n'en va pas de ce sorte, nous aurons à voir de réduire cette contrée à un état de parfaite insignifiance; car, en pareil cas, c'est ce qui arriverait de mieux à l'Angleterre!" (iv. 9.) Now M. Louis Blanc knows English almost as well as French, and we venture to believe him incapable in cold blood of so gross a mistranslation; his honesty is shown, indeed, by his printing the English text along with his translation; and we are therefore reduced to the conclusion that his habit of scenting a plot in every line of an English minister's despatch has for the moment warped his understanding of a very few plain words.

2. 'In the sitting of the House of Commons of the 19th of March, 1794' (he says, v. 386.), 'Sheridan cried out with indignation, "Would you believe, gentlemen, that there exists in England a mill employed for the manufacture of paper to make false French assignats?" On which, Mr. Taylor declared that he was able to name such mills, and had seen with his eyes the false assignats. The generous denunciations of Sheridan threw on the policy of Pitt



To deal with a work of this magnitude and importance in the compass of an ordinary article, so as to bring fully before the reader its characteristic excellences and defects, would be a task to which we feel ourselves unequal. We shall content ourselves, on the present occasion, with directing attention to the manner in which Louis Blanc has treated a few remarkable scenes and incidents in the course of his history; because these have appeared to us to furnish striking instances of his peculiarities, both of manner and substance. They illustrate, better than any general criticism of ours can do, the sources from which he derives his strength and his weakness, the extent and variety of his knowledge, the acuteness with which he applies it, the fixed predetermination with which it is made to serve the purpose of the one-sided, yet not dishonest, advocate.

1. Nothing can be more characteristic of our author than the way in which he deals with that untoward passage of history for writers on the Revolutionary side, the massacres of September. He has not deliberately hardened his conscience to apologise for them, to find in them great but melancholy acts of vigour, violent convulsions of a people seeking to deliver itself of its enemies, and so forth. He sees them, as they are seen by all men of unperverted moral sense, as crimes of the deepest dye; and he judges them with especial severity, as having more than any other event rendered the final success of his favourite cause impossible. And yet he cannot refrain from using every art of the advocate, not in palliation, but in mitigation—by diverting the reader's attention to other parallel historical facts—by dwelling on alleged or imagined provocation on the part of the victims—by detailing, with complacency,

---

'more light than it was capable of bearing; the discussion was 'stifled.' Now there is nothing improbable in such a debate having taken place, but the only authority cited for it is the 'Moniteur;' and Louis Blanc adds: 'It is remarkable that the report of this debate appears to be *omitted* in the collection of Parliamentary Debates.' The implication, of course, is that the Government suppressed it! An Englishman can only smile at so curious a supposition; a foreigner imbued with Louis Blanc's views must believe that Pitt succeeded in gagging the newspapers also: we at least have been unable to find in them any notice whatever of the supposed debate, and on that particular Wednesday the House is reported to have transacted only private business. Surely a mistake, or mystification, on the part of the 'Moniteur,' was a solution which might have presented itself. Communication was at that time so interrupted, that the news of Robespierre's fall was not published in the London papers until a fortnight after it happened.

the instances in which the satiated murderers let go their prey, or in which they halted in their work to give vent to some momentary outburst of sympathy or pity. He endeavours, above all, to relieve the established revolutionary authorities, and in especial the knot of Robespierre and his friends, from ignominy, by representing the whole as an irresistible popular outburst, instead of a deliberately planned execution. He heads the chapter in which they occur, 'Souviens-toi de la Saint-Barthélémy.' What had Maillard and his bloody jury to do with the crimes of Charles the Ninth? Nothing; but this is a rhetorical artifice to shade off something of the dark colour in which the scene must be painted by representing it as a kind of fated retaliation for the wickedness of kings in other ages. And the same artifice reappears in the final passage, in which he sums up his judgment:—

'It is false that the Commune traced out beforehand the plan of the massacres, and had it executed by a handful of hired assassins, in the middle of Paris, motionless and mute. Ah! if the system of history which has prevailed up to this time were well founded—a system maintained by the Girondins from hatred of the Montagnards, by the Royalists from hatred of the Revolution—could there be contempt enough, execration enough, for these Royalists, Girondins, ministers, Assembly, for all this nation itself, which, seized with horror, but trembling with fear, allowed all this blood to be drunk by some fifty vampires? To what epoch of history must we then ascend to find an example of universal cowardice comparable to that of which France, the land of courage, would then have afforded the spectacle? No, no, it was not thus. The days of September had that character of contagious excitement which in the thirteenth century distinguished those Sicilian vespers, in which eight thousand Frenchmen were slaughtered in two hours. . . . They had that characteristic which has been only too often met with in the annals of nations; a character of irresistible spontaneousness, which associated itself, lamentable and terrible as the truth may be, with the most ardent burst of patriotism which ever took place.' (vii. 196.)

Probably Louis Blanc is the last writer who will deny the premeditation of the massacres; 'système (as he strangely says) 'que je me flatte d'avoir renversé sans retour.' He is certainly, in our judgment, the ablest. But there have been of late many new researches made among the mass of original documents which still remains after all the havoc which caution, and shame, and neglect, have made among the records of the time, in which, as M. Ternaux says, 'chacun a effacé les marques de son courage et laissé les traces de sa honte.' And these researches have only too uniformly pointed to the same conclusion—that which patriotism and loyalty to revolutionary

principle are naturally so reluctant to admit—that of guilt, with malice aforethought.\*

On this supposition, who were the arch-culprits? There are three bodies on which the responsibility must especially weigh—the Ministry of Justice (that is, Danton), the Commune, and the Sections. Let us examine how these are dealt with in the history before us.

Against Danton the evidence is so weighty, that Louis Blanc appears rather to undertake his defence as part of his general thesis, that there was no premeditation at all, than from any hope of rescuing him individually. He ‘participated,’ he says, in the guilt of these days, but will not admit that he planned it. But it is difficult to maintain such a distinction in the case of a minister of justice, who had the very prisons in which the massacres occurred under his especial charge. We can but refer—not having room for entering on the subject in detail—to his conduct at the Conseil-Général of the Commune on the 29th August—his conversation with Louvet, recounted by the latter as early as November in a narrative not impugned by Louis Blanc himself—his interview with Prudhomme the bookseller on the 2nd of September (vii. 145.)—his address to the Assembly at one o'clock of that day, followed by the commencement of the massacre at half-past two—as affording evidence all but conclusive that the whole series of atrocities were part of a scheme preconceived and arranged in his mind. Even Louis Blanc himself, with an inconsistency for which we can hardly account, says of him, some days later, ‘Danton commençait à être embarrassé, de son coup d'état.’ If there was a ‘coup d'état,’ what becomes of the theory of ‘contagious excitement’?

Next, as to the share taken by the Commune. The reader of Revolutionary history is aware of the steps by which this usurping body had got into its hands the largest share of executive power, not in Paris only, but in the neighbouring provinces, at the time of the destruction of the monarchy on

---

\* This volume of M. Louis Blanc's work was printed in 1855. M. Granier de Cassagnac's *Histoire des Girondins et des Massacres de 'Septembre,'* appeared in 1860. The author's temper and spirit are anything but impartial, but the proofs of design which he adduces are formidable. A recent monograph by M. Sorel, on *'Le Couvent des Carmes en 1793,'* gives much help to the reader, by enabling him to fix his eye steadily on the course of events during the massacre in one particular locality—the deliberations of the Section of the Luxembourg and their immediate connexion with the murders at the Carmes as cause and effect.

the 10th of August, and is familiar with the circumstance, that its operations were all this time directed by the energetic party of the Montagne, while its feebler rival, the Assembly, was controlled by Brissot and the Girondist rhetoricians. The Town-Council, or Conseil-Général de la Commune, was the central seat of power. Now it is true enough—and Louis Blanc makes the most of it—that the procès-verbaux of this council, which are preserved, contain no direct authorisation of the massacres. It would be strange if they had. But the following are the outlines of its proceedings. By the 23rd of August, the prisons had become full of political victims:—

‘On that day’ (according to Pétion), ‘une section vint en députation au Conseil de la Commune, et déclara, formellement, que les citoyens, fatigués, indignés des retards que l’on apportait dans les jugemens, forceraient les portes de ces asiles et immoleraient à leur vengeance les coupables qui y étaient renfermés. Cette pétition, conçue dans les termes les plus délirants, n’éprouve aucune censure ; elle reçut même des applaudissemens.’

(On the 29th, the motion of Danton, already alluded to, ‘for ‘arming the necessitous\* citizens,’ was carried, ‘domiciliary visits’ ordered, together with the closing of the barrières round the city, to sweep into the prisons as many suspected as could be found, with the object—say those who insist on premeditation—of making clean work of all. Louis Blanc shows, no doubt, that the first order for these visits came from the Assembly. But the proposition was Danton’s; it was seized on with ominous energy, and appropriated by the Commune; and it is remarkable, as Louis Blanc himself shows, that from that night the expectation of approaching massacre became general in all the prisons. On the 30th, the Commune threw on the Sections the responsibility ‘d’examiner et de juger les citoyens ‘arrêtés cette nuit.’ On the 31st, Tallien, in the name of a deputation from the Commune, declared at the bar of the Assembly, ‘Nous avons fait arrêter des conspirateurs, &c. Nous ‘avons fait arrêter les prêtres perturbateurs ; ils sont enfermés ‘dans une maison particulière, et sous peu de jours le sol de la ‘liberté sera purgé de leur présence.’ On the 1st of September, the Conseil-Général of the Commune decreed the reopening of the barrières round the city : they had been closed for forty-eight hours—time enough to enclose all the destined victims in the net. And, lastly, on the evening sitting of the 2nd, when it was announced that the massacres had commenced, the same body took its measures, not to stop them, but to ‘provide for the safety of ‘all the debtors, and prisoners in civil causes!’

Such were the proceedings of the Conseil-Général. But we

must not omit to notice that, on the morning of the 2nd, just as the massacres were about to commence, it had constituted that terrible body, the Committee of Surveillance—better known to the people as the Committee of Execution—which, on the next day (the 3rd), addressed to all the municipalities its famous circular, announcing ‘qu’une partie des conspirateurs féroces, détenue dans les prisons, a été mise à mort par le peuple,’ signed by Duplain, Panis, ‘Marat, l’ami du peuple,’ and eight others, ‘constitués à la Commune, et siégeant à la Mairie.’

Next, as to the part assigned to the Sections.\* That these bodies were in constant correspondence with the Commune, and, as it were, affiliated to it, is well known. We are disposed to agree in M. de Cassagnac’s view, that they were employed by the leaders of that body in part ‘pour écarter d’elle la responsabilité, ou au moins la clameur publique.’ We have seen that on the 30th of August, as soon as the prisons were full, the Commune had thrown on the Sections the responsibility of further action. In the morning of the 2nd of September, most of the Sections answered the appeal, as if by common consent; the most patriotic demanding in direct terms the death of all the ‘conspirators’ in the prisons, in order to ‘secure Paris’ from their ferocious violence during the absence of its defenders on the frontier! To render the scene more intelligible, let us observe the proceedings of one section only, that of the Luxembourg, in which the old Couvent des Carmes, then a prison for priests, was situated, as they are recounted in M. Sorel’s little volume already quoted. We find the Assembly of that section meeting on the morning of the 2nd of September, at Saint Sulpice. A discussion as to the fate of the prisoners in the Carmes is immediately opened. A member proposes ‘de se débarrasser des prisonniers, et surtout des prêtres.’ Ceyrat, president, said, ‘Tous qui sont détenus aux Carmes sont coupables, et il est tems que le peuple en fasse justice.’ On this three members are sent to the Commune, ‘pour lui communiquer ce vœu, afin de pouvoir agir d’une manière uniforme.’ Just as they are starting on this errand, one of the three, M. Lohier, asks, ‘Comment on entendit se débarrasser des prisonniers? Par la mort, s’écrièrent à la fois plusieurs citoyens, et le président lui-même.’ At two o’clock the same president, Ceyrat, goes to the convent, has the list of prisoners called over, and orders

---

\* Very complete accounts of the character and composition of these bodies in 1792 are given by Mortimer-Ternaux and by De Cassagnac. They form a curious chapter in Revolutionary history, and one not generally understood.

them to assemble in the garden. At four, Maillard and his band enter, and the work of death is done.

We must say that we consider the case of premeditation proved, as far as mere circumstantial evidence can prove such an issue. The compilers of the '*Histoire Parlementaire*,' MM. Buchez and Roux, were themselves revolutionary doctrinaires of the stiffest order; they really hold the massacres justifiable on the fatalist theory (xvii. 322.), and they had not the benefit of the fuller evidence since adduced by De Cassagnac and others. And yet even they are compelled, by a sense of historical duty, to adopt the same conclusion. After balancing for a while the arguments in favour of and against premeditation, they thus sum up the case, fairly enough, to the effect that the massacres were organised; that '*ce fut l'un des trois derniers jours d'août que l'exécution dont il s'agit fut arrêtée. . . . Que le Comité de Surveillance ait été l'ordonnateur des massacres, c'est sur quoi il ne peut rester aucun doute.*'

Such is, as it seems to us, the fundamental error of this portion of Louis Blanc's history. But his treatment of the details of the subject is still more paradoxical. As we have said, his reprobation of the whole proceeding, and his rejection of the sophistries by which his fellow-politicians have tried to palliate it, is manly and uncompromising. But, having offered this sacrifice to virtue, he then devotes himself to using the materials before him in such a way as to soften as far as possible every horror, and give the murderers the benefit of every favourable interpretation which can be suggested of any of their actions. He finds in Maillard and his jury a tribunal terrible indeed, but on its own principles calm and just as Rhadamanthus, '*en présence duquel la meilleure protection était de n'en point avoir, et où toutes les ressources de l'esprit étaient nulles si elles n'étaient fondées sur la vérité.*' He finds in the hideous formulas '*A la Force*' and '*Elargissez Monsieur,*' with which the victims were delivered over to the murderers, the dictates of a delicate sympathy, '*comme pour épargner à la victime, jusqu'au dernier moment, la certitude de son sort!*' He believes in the absurd, though no doubt attested, story that the massacres of the prisoners in their transit from the Mairie to the Abbaye, on the 2nd, was provoked by the act of one of them, a priest, in thrusting his arm out of a carriage window and striking an armed *fédéré* on the head with a stick! It is true that the Abbé Sicard, one of the prisoners, says nothing of this; but then, observes Louis Blanc, the abbé being in the leading carriage might not have seen what was going on behind him. He omits altogether to state what the

abbé *does* say — namely, that the work of blood commenced by wanton thrusts and cuts at the prisoners within the carriages :— ‘ Un de mes camarades reçut un coup de sabre sur l'épaule, un autre fut blessé à la joue, un autre au-dessus du nez,’ and so forth ; so that if anything like the event of the stick did occur, it was evidently in some desperate or mechanical attempt at self-defence against outrages already begun. He tries to show that the priests were killed by their guardians as a measure of precaution, because they endeavoured to escape from the carriage ; and that ‘ l'abbé Sicard et deux de ses compagnons, qui n'essayaient pas de fuir, furent épargnés.’ But what the abbé actually says is, that four occupants of his own carriage having been killed or wounded, ‘ les égorgeurs s'imaginent qu'il n'y a plus rien à faire dans cette première voiture ; ils ne croient pas qu'il y ait un de plus, et ils se portent avec la même rage sur la seconde voiture,’ and that he thus escaped unobserved. We are compelled to notice this discrepancy, because any one merely noticing Louis Blanc's foot-notes would suppose that he was following the abbé's narrative, when he is in fact only using so much of it as suits his purpose, and dovetailing this into fragments of other narratives which please him better.

A few pages farther we find, to our astonishment, the monsters who, according to the common story, forced Mademoiselle de Sombreuil to drink a glass of blood, converted into gentlemen of polite attentions :—

‘ Mademoiselle de Sombreuil (after begging off her father), appearing on the point of fainting, one of these barbarous men, seized with a sudden emotion, ran to her, and offered her a glass of water, into which, at the moment when it approached her lips, there fell a drop of blood from the murderer's hand. Such is the origin of the hideous fable which represents the daughter as forced to drink a glass of blood as the price of her father's safety. I have this fact’ (he adds in a note) ‘ from a lady, who herself was informed of it by Mademoiselle de Sombreuil, whose friend she had been. And the curious thing is that the latter used to recount it in order to show that the men of September, cruel as they were, appeared by no means inaccessible to pity.’

Such is Louis Blanc's version of the tale. Now for Granier de Cassagnac's (‘ Histoire des Girondins,’ vol. ii. p. 225.) :—

‘ To doubt the truth of the received story becomes impossible in the face of the following attestation, which has been addressed to us by the son of Mademoiselle de Sombreuil (who became Countess de Villelume) :—

‘ “ My mother, sir, did not like speaking of those terrible times. I have never questioned her, . . . but I have heard her often say that at

the time of the massacre M. de Saint-Mart went out from the tribunal before her father, and was killed by a blow which cleft his skull; that she then covered her father with her body, wrestled long with the murderers, and received three wounds. . . . After a long struggle, one of the men, taking a glass, mixed in it the blood from M. de Saint-Mart's head, with wine and gunpowder, and then said that if she would drink it to the health of the nation, she should save her father. She did so without hesitation, and was then carried in triumph by the same men."

To borrow an exclamation from M. Louis Blanc himself, 'Ce qui précède suffit pour montrer s'il est vrai que l'histoire de la Révolution est faite, ainsi que tant de gens se l'imaginent!'

One fact more, which, though of a trifling order in itself, illustrates the peculiar readiness of M. Louis Blanc's mind to scepticism, or to credulity, according as each may favour the particular object which he has in view. He takes upon himself to discredit the horrible murder of the woman known as 'la belle Bouquetière,' at the Conciergerie—an event told with a variety of details by all the historians of the Revolution. 'Le fait,' he says, 'n'est pas très-sûr. Le nom de la victime ne se trouve pas sur le registre d'écrou de la prison où on a prétendu qu'elle était renfermée.' Nor is her name, he adds, in Prudhomme's list. The ulterior purpose of this little piece of incredulity is plain enough—that, namely, of diminishing the horrors of the scene by representing it as the result of a fit of popular terror and fanaticism, and not aggravated by mere lust of blood. There can, however, be no doubt of the truth of the common story. The evidence may be read in Granier de Cassagnac (vol. ii. p. 343.). It is quite true that the name of the wretched woman in question, Marie Gredeler, does not appear in the écrou, or in the registre des entrées of the prison, preserved in the archives of the police; but the reason is given in the following 'declaration' by the concierge, annexed to the latter:—

'Toutes les femmes ont été mises en liberté. Il y en avait soixante et quinze; et la bouquetière seule a péri. On ne peut également donner la liste des femmes: le registre qui contient leurs noms ayant été enlevé, le 3 septembre dernier, du greffier; et depuis ce tems, malgré les instances du citoyen Richard' (the concierge), 'il n'a pu parvenir à l'avoir.' (P. 367.)

It is strange, after all, that our author should not perceive how seriously these attempts to put the best colour on particular acts of the Septembriseurs interfere with his general argument, that the massacres were unpremeditated. If the murderers were not a mere mob of excited ruffians, but organised execu-



tioners, doing their work under a perverted sense of public virtue—if they did not kill at random, but constituted tribunals respectable for their impartiality, though blamable for their severity—if they had regular forms of proceeding and words of order—if they condemned with reluctance, and acquitted with enthusiasm—if they respected the property of their victims—all this is convincing proof that they were not the agents in a casual work, but regularly enrolled, instructed, and drilled for the dreadful service required of them.

Of course, adopting the theory of non-premeditation, Louis Blanc also acquits the leading revolutionists, one by one, of the share which they were respectively supposed to have had in the grand design. When public indignation began to direct itself against the 'Septembriseurs' as early as the November following, one and all of these personages (even Marat inclusive) sought to exculpate himself from the charge by positive denial—denial which M. Louis Blanc surely cannot expect us, as he seems to do, to take as disproof. We will, however, only say on this head, that it seems to us that the three on whom the memory of those days weighs most heavily are Danton, to whom the massacres were a necessary revolutionary measure; Marat, the monomaniac, who saw in them the realisation of a long sanguinary dream; and Panis, the lawyer, Santerre's brother-in-law, who seems to have planned and executed his share of the business with complete professional sang-froid—who was, therefore, perhaps the worst of the triumvirate, and who died in his bed at nearly eighty years of age.

With regard to Robespierre, Louis Blanc has a better case; but he overstates it. That Robespierre knew beforehand of the intended massacres we have no doubt, as did every leading Montagnard. But there is no evidence that he had any share in planning or executing them; and to suppose that he had, is to imagine that he acted contrary to his ordinary practice of allowing others to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for him. But we cannot agree that 'son rôle se réduisit à gémir et à ne rien faire. Deux fois seulement il apparaît à la scène' (he means, apparently, at the Commune, or in its concerns), 'le soir du 1 septembre, pour demander que le Conseil-Général soit modifié par voie électorale . . . qu'en un mot le pouvoir soit remis au peuple; le soir du 2 septembre, pour déplorer l'état de la France, en mettant au nombre de ses périls la conspiration en faveur du duc de Brunswick, &c.' No doubt Robespierre protested all this afterwards.

'J'ignore les faits; je ne les nie, ni ne les crois. Je n'ai jamais été chargé d'aucune espèce de commission, ni ne me suis mêlé en aucune

manière, d'aucune opération particulière. . . . Ceux qui ont dit que j'avais eu la moindre part aux évènements dont je parle sont des hommes ou excessivement crédules, ou excessivement pervers,' &c. &c.\*

But, unless M. Granier de Cassagnac absolutely invents the documents which he quotes ('Hist. des Girondins,' vol. ii. ch. 2.), Robespierre not only introduced the two motions mentioned above—the second, at all events, suspicious enough, for it was in reality an attack on Brissot, the object at the time of his peculiar hatred and jealousy, who very nearly got massacred in consequence †—but he was constantly present at the sittings of the Conseil-Général at the Commune, throughout the massacres. On the 3rd, Robespierre, Manuel, and Delroy were named by that body Commissioners to protect the Temple, where the royal family were imprisoned: it seems false, therefore, that he 'accepted no commission.' In truth, as soon as the public conscience had become a little awakened on the subject of these horrors, Robespierre seems to have proposed to himself two objects—to disclaim all personal participation in them, and at the same time to apologise for the perpetrators. 'Le calme impudent,' says Granier de Cassagnac, 'avec lequel Robespierre décline toute complicité dans les massacres de septembre, ne saurait être comparé qu'au calme féroce dont il en parle.'

2. The following is an extract from the very powerful chapter which comprises the execution of Louis XVI. (vol. viii. p. 80.):—

'The procession arrived at the place of execution preceded by a sound of wheels and of horses. Louis was reading in his breviary the psalms of the dying, while his confessor, his soul entirely occupied with the thought of the abortive plot for rescue, was counting the minutes in silent anxiety. A hope as vain as those rapid flashes of light which render the night blacker after darting through it! An implacable vigilance has foreseen all, and of those 500 persons whom a compact of intrepid fidelity attaches to the King, five-and-twenty only have reached the rendezvous. At ten minutes past ten they arrived at the foot of the scaffold. It had been erected in front of the palace of the Tuileries, on the place which had been called after Louis XV., on the spot where had stood the statue of the most profligate of kings, deceased tranquilly in his bed. The condemned man took three minutes to get out of his carriage. At the moment

---

\* Robespierre, *Lettres à ses Commettans*.

† On the evening of the 3rd, at eight p.m., we find Robespierre, with other chiefs of the Revolution, at Danton's, discussing the events of the day. Mandar, an honest man, not at all deep in their deliberations, pressed them to put an end to the horrors which were passing by getting the Assembly to establish a dictatorship for the crisis. 'Garde-t'en bien!' exclaimed Robespierre, 'Brissot serait dictateur.'

of leaving the Temple he had refused his over-coat, which Cléry had presented him; he wore a brown coat, white waistcoat, grey breeches, white stockings. His hair was not in disorder; no change was remarked on his countenance. The Abbé de Firmont was in a plain black coat. A great empty space had been left round the scaffold, fenced off with artillery; beyond, as far as the eye could reach, was a multitude without arms. When the executioner came to open the door of the carriage, Louis recommended his confessor to his care; and that in the tone of a master. When he had descended from the carriage, he fixed his eyes on the ranks of soldiers which surrounded him, and cried with a terrible voice, "Be silent!" The drums stopped, but having begun again, on a sign from their chief, he cried out, "What treachery! I am lost, I am lost!"—for it seems that up to this moment he had preserved some hope. The executioners surrounded him to take off his upper dress; he repulsed them haughtily, and himself undid his collar. But when they attempted to bind his hands, all the blood in his veins appeared to kindle. "Do you mean to tie my hands?" A struggle was about to take place—it did take place. "It is certain," says Mercier, "that Louis had a kind of 'battle with his executioners.'" The Abbé Edgworth remained uncertain, terrified, speechless. At last, when his master seemed to question him by his looks, "Sire," said he, "in this new outrage I only see a last feature of resemblance between your Majesty and 'that God who is about to be your reward.'" At these words, the anger of the man giving place to the humility of the Christian, Louis said to the executioners, "I will drink this cup to the dregs." They tied his hands, they cut his hair; after which, leaning on his confessor's arm, he proceeded to ascend the steps of the guillotine (which were very steep), with a slow step and air of exhaustion. But on reaching the last step, he suddenly rouses himself, crosses rapidly the whole breadth of the scaffold, advances to the left side of it, and commanding the drums to be silent by his gesture, cries, "I die innocent of all the crimes which are imputed to me." His face was very red; and, according to the narrative of his confessor, "his voice was so loud that it could be heard at the Pont-Tournant." Some others of his words were very distinctly heard: "I pardon the authors of my death, and I pray God that the blood which you are about to shed may never lie on the head of France." He would have continued, but his voice was drowned by the roll of drums, at the signal, it is said, of the actor Dugazon, without waiting for the order of Santerre. "Silence! keep silence!" shouted Louis XVI., beside himself; and he was seen to stamp violently on the scaffold several times. Richard, one of the executioners, had seized a pistol, and aimed it at the unhappy man; it was necessary to drag him down by force. No sooner was he bound to the fatal plank, than he uttered dreadful cries, which the fall of the knife interrupted by severing his head from his body. Sanson, the executioner, took up the head, and showed it to the people; and the people shouted, "Vive la République!" (vol. viii. p. 80.)

In short, according to the statement of Louis Blanc, the un-

fortunate King, instead of dying with the resignation usually ascribed to him, exhibited both fear and fury—struggled with his executioners, and endeavoured to prolong the scene in the expectation of a rescue. Now, when we come to examine the authorities which Louis Blanc has very profusely cited in his foot-notes, we find that his tale is made up in the following manner. The authorities in question are the well-known narrative ascribed to the King's confessor, the Abbé Edgworth de Firmont (printed in the collection of 'Memoirs of the Revolution' as 'Les Dernières Heures de Louis XVI.');

the newspapers, and official reports of the day; Mercier, in his 'Nouveau Paris;' and an account said to have proceeded from Santerre, and to be contained in certain MS. memoirs of Mercier du Rocher, a deputy, to whom the writer has had access. Of the last of these authorities we cannot of course speak, but the name of Santerre does not inspire much confidence, still less his alleged narration at second hand. Now the abbé says that the King died with calmness and dignity; but he mentions something of the plot which had been confided to him. Mercier (a careless though picturesque writer, who either felt or affected a fanatical hostility to the dethroned race), and one or two of the political scribes of the day, affirm the struggle on the scaffold; but they say nothing of the plot. By ingeniously combining the features of one story with those of the other, Louis Blanc has made a plausible whole: reasonable enough, if stated only as a theory; but this is not history, fairly told.

But we are forced to add, that the charge of over-ingenuity is not the only one to which this part of his story is open. The manner of Louis's death—whether he did or did not struggle on the scaffold—was a good deal questioned at the time of the occurrence. The dispute brought forth a letter from Sanson, the chief executioner himself, which appeared in the 'Thermomètre du Jour,' a newspaper, of the 21st of February, 1793. We quote it from Croker's 'Essays on the Early Period of the French Revolution,' p. 255. If that letter be genuine, there is an end of all discussion. Sanson distinctly says that the King met his fate 'with a *sang froid* and firmness which astonished 'us all,' and that the only thing approaching to a struggle which took place was the momentary difficulty which he made when ordered to take off his coat, 'saying that they might as well execute him as he was;' and when his hands were to be tied, to which he submitted on the persuasion of his confessor. To suppose that Sanson, though he is said to have been a Royalist at heart, could have misrepresented so public a scene, when his own 'valets,' and every one else on or near the

scaffold could at once have contradicted him (and that in opposition to the popular feeling), would be simply absurd. Why, then, does Louis Blanc not quote or allude to this decisive document? Even if he doubts its authenticity, why does he not say so? It cannot be from ignorance, for he cites Croker's curious compilation over and over again, and has evidently studied its details with attention. We can only say — and we say it with regret — the whole of this piece of tragic romance is an instance of what a partisan history seems inevitably to become, even in the hands of an honest man.

3. Our next example shall be from the account of the death of the Hector of Louis Blanc's *Iliad* — the much misunderstood Robespierre. Everybody is aware that, according to ordinary history, he shot himself; but a certain Méda afterwards claimed, or was said to have claimed, the honour of firing the shot. 'Few believed Méda,' says Carlyle, pithily, 'in what was otherwise incredible.' But a reader thus slightly forewarned will feel somewhat astonished at the simple positiveness of the following narrative, in which the common story is not controverted, but boldly ignored altogether:—

'Profiting by the confusion, and finding the road free, a gendarme called Méda, who had served in the Constitutional Guard of Louis XVI., and who was, therefore, called "Veto" among his comrades, glides secretly up the staircase of the Hôtel de Ville, swarming at this moment with a crowd of distracted people, penetrates into the Salle de Conseil by declaring himself to be despatched with secret orders, reaches the door of the secretaries' office, knocks, and has the door opened to him by means of the same falsehood. The assassin carried two pistols hidden in his shirt. Among fifty persons, who appeared extremely agitated, he recognises him of whom his eyes were in search. Robespierre was seated in an arm-chair, his left elbow resting on his knee, his head leaning against his right hand. The assassin aims at his breast, but the ball reaches Robespierre at the level of the mouth and breaks his jaw. The bystanders disperse, horror-stricken. Some of them steal down a back staircase, carrying off Couthon. The assassin takes up a torch, hastens after them, and, the wind having extinguished his light, fires his second pistol at a venture, and wounds in the leg one of the bearers who carried Couthon.' (xi. 256.)

This narrative, given with so precise and authentic an air, has been in fact mainly adopted from the so-called '*Précis Historique de Méda*,' although our author says himself (p. 272.) that this *précis* is full of falsehoods, and 'suspects it to be a fabrication!' Let us look nearer.

The only particulars, or nearly so, recorded by *contemporary authority* of the capture of Robespierre and his followers are to

be found in the document styled the second 'Report of Citizen 'Courtois to the Convention.' From this we learn that, when Léonard Bourdon, with a few armed men, burst into their last retreat in the Hôtel de Ville, at two in the morning, the following were the fates of the chiefs of the party:—Robespierre the younger sprang from a window, complaining that he had no pistol to kill himself with; Lebas shot himself dead; Saint-Just, when arrested, had a knife in his hand; Henriot either threw himself out of a window or was thrown by Coffinhal; Couthon only (paralytic) had taken no part in violence against himself or others. Everything points to the conclusion that these bold savages, tracked to their den, had resolved to die a Roman death together, after a fashion which better men than they had adopted in various critical moments of the Revolution, both before them and after them. Now, among these Robespierre the elder is found, wounded by a pistol-ball through his jaw. Two witnesses (Dulac, whom Louis Blanc calls a spy, and Bochart, a porter, on whom no suspicion seems to attach) depose positively that he shot himself; and their testimony, when fairly examined, contains only that amount of slight inconsistency and vagueness which might fairly be counted on in such a scene of confusion.

Now, what is the evidence to contradict this simple account? None whatever, except the story of Méda, the gendarme. This person, then a lad of eighteen, either preceded (as he says himself) or accompanied Léonard Bourdon into the room. He had no doubt some hand in seizing the 'rebels;' and it seems probable that he fired a pistol in the *mêlée*. Soon after, he is said to have boasted, first, that he had shot a 'conspirator or two,' afterwards, that he had shot Robespierre. Four years later, he urged his services done on that day as a ground for special recompense, but advancing his claim in very guarded language, without mentioning Robespierre by name; while the certificate of Tallien, which accompanies his memorial (discovered by Louis Blanc in MS. in a collection of autographs) only says 'qu'il s'empara de Robespierre.' And this is all. For the narrative, published after Méda's death in his name, is, as we have seen, justly discredited by Louis Blanc himself (as well as by Croker in his 'Essays') as a mere tissue of impudent lies, and probably (to do Méda justice—who fell at Borodino, a colonel and a baron) the fabrication of some book-maker.

This, we say, is all, with the exception of what is really more important than all the rest—the deposition of the two surgeons, Verger and Marriguiet, who examined and dressed the wound.

That report is 'absolutely conclusive in favour of the suicide,' says the author of the article 'Robespierre' in the 'Biographie Universelle' (Michaud). That report 'is an unanswerable argument *against* the supposition of suicide,' says Louis Blanc, triumphantly. Which is right? Of course, the surgeons' report ought to speak for itself. But, unluckily, it will not speak for itself—it is full of that scientific ambiguity which has so often been the despair of a lawyer engaged in investigating a criminal case:—

'Le coup de pistolet' (so it runs) 'avait porté au niveau de la bouche, à un pouce de la commissure des lèvres. Comme sa direction était oblique, de dehors en dedans, de gauche à droite, de haut en bas, et que la plaie pénétrait dans la bouche, elle intéressait extérieurement la peau, &c. &c. Mais il nous a été impossible de suivre le trajet du plomb, et nous n'avons trouvé ni contre-ouverture, ni indice de la balle.'

It is impossible, exclaims our author, to imagine a man discharging a ball at himself at the level of the mouth, from left to right, and from above to below. Certainly; but that is not the supposition. Thus far is clear: the orifice of the only external wound was in the left cheek, so near the eye, apparently, that 'il y avait ecchymose à l'œil du même côté.' If Robespierre shot himself in the mouth, then this wound was made by the ball in coming out. If Robespierre was shot, then it was made by the ball in entering. Now on the first supposition all is consistent, and we have only to get rid of an ambiguity in the language of the surgeons, occasioned, apparently, by their having described the wound as they had probed it, namely, from without (at the place of exit) to within (at the place of discharge). On the second supposition, the following questions have to be answered—What became of the ball?—did it come out without making a second wound anywhere? And, how could such a shot possibly be fired, unless, indeed, by a left-handed man?—as to which, the wonderful account given by the real or supposed Méda himself may be received by those who can receive it: 'A ces mots, je prends de la main *gauche* un de mes pistolets, et, fuisant un à droite, je tire. Je croyais le frapper à la poitrine, mais la balle le prend *au menton* et lui casse la *mâchoire gauche inférieure*.' And, lastly, Courtois' 'Rapport' was got up, according to Louis Blanc, in order to favour the official supposition of suicide: how came Courtois to insert, and to lay stress on, a surgical report which proves incontestably (according to Louis Blanc) that there was *no* suicide? or how came all the world, at the time, to understand that report in the sense of Michaud, and not in that of Louis Blanc?

If the question were really worth farther inquiry, it would be interesting to know what object the leaders of the Convention had in framing a false report, and forging several documents, in order to make out that Robespierre shot himself instead of being shot by a gendarme. Not to inflict additional disgrace on the victim; for in that fierce day suicide brought none. To clear themselves of the disgrace of profiting by an 'assassination,' says Louis Blanc; and repeats, rhetorically, this phrase of 'assassinat,' as if mere reiteration could produce the slightest effect on any reader acquainted with the patent facts of the case. Robespierre and his associates were in open rebellion against the Convention, and some of them armed. If the first gendarme who made his way into their room *had* fired a pistol at Robespierre, it might have been an act of unnecessary violence, but to call it an 'assassination' is an outrageous abuse of words. The political enemies who had just been proclaiming Robespierre an outlaw, a monster, and a tyrant, and invoking public vengeance on his head, must have been seized with a strangely squeamish fit, if they were so shocked at his meeting his death from the hand of an armed officer of the peace, as to resort to all kinds of fictions in order to substitute a story of suicide.

We will add one word only on the details of this gloomy scene. As Robespierre lay wounded on the table at the Hôtel de Ville, the poor wretch, not having a handkerchief to apply to his bleeding face, was seen to use for the purpose 'a little bag of white leather, on which were inscribed the words, "Au grand monarque, Lecomte, fourbisseur du Roi et de ses troupes," &c. Of course, the inference was that this was the bag which had held the pistol used by Robespierre. Will it be believed that Louis Blanc indulges so far in childish suspicion as to believe that 'somebody had slipped the bag into his hand 'in order to accredit the supposition of a suicide?' and not only this, but—at four in the morning, in the confusion of that fearful crisis—'had taken care to choose an inscription proper 'to suggest the idea that the chief of the Jacobins had been 'overthrown because he wanted to make himself king?' How the mysterious bag could suggest both ideas at once—that of suicide and that of tyrannicide—Louis Blanc does not condescend to explain.\*

\* It is a trifling but not altogether insignificant circumstance, that Robespierre (according to Louis Blanc) had amused himself a good deal in his later days with pistol-shooting, and attained considerable skill in the practice (vol. xi. p. 178.).



4. An entire chapter, appropriately headed 'Les Mystères du Temple,' is devoted in our author's latest volume to the fate of the young Dauphin, styled, in Legitimist remembrance, Louis XVII. And it would not be easy to find a more ingenious display of the talent for weaving into a specious fabric a confused assemblage of loose hints, indications, and surmises. 'L'enfant qui mourut dans la Tour du Temple, le 20 ~~Primaire~~, an III (8 juin 1795) était-il le Dauphin, fils de Louis XVI., ou bien un enfant substitué?' This question Louis Blanc does not categorically answer. He does not endeavour to carry the reader's conviction by force; but he gradually develops his case of suspicion, with every appearance of fairness, until the most commonplace reader feels his imagination half-seduced, and his reason half seduced into acquiescence. While he does not adopt in the slightest degree the pretensions of any one of the false Dauphins, he entices us towards the belief that their common story had its negative basis of truth in the fact that the child was removed from his prison. On the 19th of January, 1794, mysterious noises were heard by the Princess Royal, proceeding, apparently, from her brother's room—'Nous restâmes 'persuadées,' she says in her narrative, 'qu'il était parti.' On that day, accordingly, the evasion is supposed to have taken place. 'La femme Simon,' the widow of the savage keeper from whom the child had so much to suffer, is said to have affirmed the same to her dying day. On that date, at all events, Simon was removed. For some months afterwards the imprisoned child, whoever he was, had no special keeper; he was visited only by commissioners, constantly changed. He was condemned to absolute silence, absolute solitude—'précautions 'incompréhensibles, à moins que leur but n'ait été d'empêcher l'enfant d'être vu.' In July, 1794, after the fall of Robespierre, a new keeper (Laurent) was appointed. On the 31st of that month, several members of the Committee of General Safety visited the Temple. What did they find? A child, almost motionless, his back bent nearly double, arms, legs, and thighs of unnatural size. But, what was most remarkable of all, this child never spoke. 'Cent questions lui furent faites, il ne répondit à aucune.' His guardianship was now changed, his condition ameliorated; but he was slowly dying, and in all the course of his decline he remained mute. When a deputation of the Commune visited his cell in February, 1795, 'il était impossible de tirer un mot de lui.' This mysterious silence was said, by his attendants, to have lasted ever since his mother's trial, in 1793, when an attempt had been made to force him to give evidence against her—a tale which no one but a romantic

Legitimist could believe of so mere a child. At last, on the 6th of May, 1795, the Convention sent him a physician. This was the famous Desault. He was as silent to Desault as he had been to others. On the 1st of June, Desault himself suddenly died. It was immediately reported that he had been poisoned because he refused to kill the Dauphin. That, says our author, is a fable. But Desault had visited the royal family in 1790. Desault must have been in a condition to affirm that the dumb child in the Temple was *not* the Dauphin. That was the reason of Desault's sudden death. Choppart, the chemist, who had made up Desault's prescriptions, might have learned the truth from Desault. Therefore Choppart died suddenly also, six days after the physician. And in two days more, on June 8th, the unhappy child died also. But his death, notwithstanding the suspicious coincidence, was certainly natural. His 'acte de décès' was, however, only drawn up on the 12th. Why this delay? 'Y eut-il hésitation sur la question de savoir 's'il valait mieux avouer l'évasion ou faire un faux?'

Where, meanwhile, was the real Dauphin, who had escaped in January, 1794? Who can say? Our author believes in none of the pretenders:—

'We have reason to be surprised,' he says, 'at the utter disappearance of the Prince; but our surprise may perhaps be diminished when we remember that at the date of the escape the Dauphin was only nine years old; that he was consequently given up, without defence, to every kind of treachery; that all Europe was at this time in a state of frightful confusion, that the Royalist party was a nursery of intrigues . . . that the Count de Provence, called upon to wear the crown in default of direct heirs, joined to profound cunning a violent desire to reign; that he had a powerful interest in leaving, under the clouds with which events had enveloped it, the destiny of his nephew; that after the Restoration, which placed Louis XVIII. on the throne, the discovery of a Louis XVII. would have once more placed the whole destiny of the country in question, and created incalculable embarrassments; that under these circumstances a somewhat unscrupulous government *might* have made family considerations yield to exigencies of what is called "la raison d'État," or, if it was ignorant of the truth, determine not to learn it.' (xii. 365.)

We must hasten to say, that the above romantic narrative is not ours, but a summary of that suggested as persuasively as possible by Louis Blanc. We are appalled by the abyss of crime, worthy of Cæsarean or Oriental history, which this cunning mixture of story and argument seems to reveal. And it is quite a relief to find the tale end with only one murder more, of comparatively little consequence.

'On the 4th of March, 1820, a certain Caron, who had been employed in the kitchen service of Louis XVI., who had succeeded in getting himself admitted to the Temple after the transfer of the royal family to that prison, and who possessed, or affected to possess, important and secret details concerning the escape of the son of Louis XVI., disappeared suddenly, immediately after a series of visits from a great personage of the Court; nor could his family ever recover a trace of him. How is this disappearance to be explained?' (P. 367.)

But the reader may be reassured, if it is in the power of mere critics like ourselves to reassure him. We are thoroughly persuaded that the whole story of this 'evasion,' and the catalogue of woes which is made so ingeniously to depend on it, is as complete a romance as any creation of Dumas or Victor Hugo. It is impossible, within our limits, to attempt the disproof, but we will confine ourselves to one leading feature in the case. The whole fabric rests on the supposition that the substituted child was dumb. It was necessary he should be so; otherwise the trick must have been found out. Now, in the first place, the difficulty of finding, and appropriating, a *dumb* child, not deaf and dumb, nor imbecile, which this one certainly was not, of the exact age, could have been no slight one. But let this pass. When we come to the evidence of the few eye-witnesses, we find it entirely against the supposition. Some say that he did not speak in their hearing; some, that he spoke seldom; one or two, that he spoke often; not one, that he *could* not speak. The advocate can, therefore, only make out his case by discrediting those very witnesses on whom he is at the same time forced to rely in the absence of all other testimony. A very false position, as advocates accustomed to their task are well aware. Louis Blanc rejects the story of the particular words said to have been addressed by the boy to Doctor Pelletan (p. 359.). Nor are they probable. Does it follow that the boy said nothing to the doctor? He rejects the positive testimony of Gomin, one of the attendants. He does not even mention the words said to have been addressed by the child to the commissioners who visited him on the 31st of July, 1794 (see Croker's 'Essays,' p. 281.), nor the more doubtful ones to the 'two or three persons whose unexpected kindness obtained 'from him a whisper of acknowledgement' (*Ib.* p. 288.). Another attendant, Lasne, on one of the several trials to which the pretensions of the false Dauphins gave rise, testified, in 1834, that the child could not only speak, but held conversation with him and his fellows of a character far above his years; evidence which was no doubt much too complacently accepted by Croker, whose anatomising incredulity as to stories

which did not suit him was combined at times with a singular facility in adopting such as did. Being again examined on the same subject in 1837, Lasne departed altogether from his former statement, and said that he never heard him speak but once. Because an old witness, forty years after the event, designedly or forgetfully contradicts himself as to whether the child spoke often or spoke once, Louis Blanc concludes—that he was dumb!

We believe that we can set the reader's mind at ease on another serious point in the case—the tragical death of Desault. It so happens that this eminent man was at the head of the most distinguished medical school of Paris; that several of his scholars were aware of his illness, and some present at his death; and that the most celebrated among them all, the famous Bichat, inserted the following notice of his teacher in Millin's 'Mugasin Encyclopédique' for 1795, only a few months after the event:—

'Les troubles du premier Prairial, dernières agitations des agens du crime, affectèrent profondément son âme. La crainte de voir les proscriptions se renouveler le saisit; . . . et dès-lors on le vit traîner une vie languissante. . . . Tous les symptômes d'une fièvre maligne se déclarèrent dans la nuit du 29 mai; bientôt leurs rapides accroissemens, l'impuissance des moyens que leur opposaient des mains habiles, firent présager quelle en seroit la fin. Les élèves apprirent en même temps sa maladie et le danger où il étoit. Ils accoururent, . . . mais déjà il ne pouvoit plus les distinguer. Un délire presque continuël, depuis l'invasion de sa maladie, lui épargna le sentiment pénible des approches de la mort, qui vint terminer ses jours, *entre les bras de ses élèves*, le 1 juin 1795. Le vulgaire se persuade qu'il avoit été empoisonné; le bruit, *accrédité encore aujourd'hui* dans l'esprit de quelques personnes, eut pour fondement l'époque de sa mort, qui ne précéda que de quelques jours celle du fils de Louis XVI., qu'il voyoit malade dans sa prison du Temple. On publia qu'il mourait victime de son refus constant de se prêter à des vues criminelles sur la vie de cet enfant. Quel est l'homme célèbre, dont la mort n'a pas été le sujet des fausses conjectures du public?'

Bichat, we may add, was a man whose personal honour is spoken of almost as highly as his professional genius; and, as he could not be deceived in such a case, he must, if Desault was murdered, have deliberately falsified his account. And, lastly, Louis Blanc's story—which rests on no evidence whatever except popular belief, and the notions afterwards expressed by certain old women of Desault's family—supposes the leaders of the Convention to have been the most daring, as well as masterly of murderers, since they first poisoned the ablest doctor in Paris, and then allowed him to die '*entre les bras de ses élèves*!'

5. Perhaps the most characteristic chapter in the whole work before us is the fourth of volume eleven, entitled 'History of the Maximum.' It is curious from the vigour with which it is written, from the obstinate nature of the paradoxes which it involves, above all from its connexion with the marked though brief part which the author had to play in the great theatre of the world. Visions of the Luxembourg of 1848 and its extraordinary tenants, of the attempted organisation of labour, and of all the follies of that mock Revolution, rise before the reader's imagination as he peruses these pages. He sees clearly that, for the moment, the author was not the humble student of a London lodging, but was carried back to his ephemeral popular throne.

'All ruling fate itself hath not the power  
To alter what hath been; and he hath had his hour.'

The assignats, as is well known, began to be extravagantly issued in 1792, and by the middle of 1793 had reached the formidable amount of five 'milliards' of francs, the ordinary circulation requiring probably two milliards only. Of course coin disappeared, and prices rose. Thus far Louis Blanc is in accordance with former authorities; but, in his characteristic way, he keeps out of sight as far as possible the obvious cause of depreciation, namely, over issue, and makes as much as he can of all sorts of minor causes—dark plots of the enemies of the Republic—systematic forgeries, the deliberate and traitorous competition of the old assignats 'à face royale;' traitorous opposition to the sale of public lands on which the assignats were based, and so forth. The Convention, however, fought their way as well as they could through the difficulties of depreciation, until these affected the lower classes. By a law of political economy, often developed, the price of labour, when the currency is in excess, rises more slowly than that of articles of consumption. Thus, in 1795 (to anticipate a little), when a day's labour was worth forty francs in assignats, a pair of shoes was worth two hundred, and a cup of coffee ten. The representative body, in 1793, was already besieged with complaints. To meet these, the 'Maximum,' or law fixing the highest price of articles of 'first necessity,' was not only devised, but, with the almost incredible daring of those times, actually carried into execution, in June, 1793. Some represent it as a tyrannical act of confiscation; others as a measure which encountered such difficulties in the execution that its practical effect was slight. Not so Louis Blanc. He sees in it the powerful though irregular remedy

which stopped the depreciation of assignats, and thereby saved the Revolution!

'Whatever we may think of it,' he says, 'this much cannot be too often remarked—that until the 9th Thermidor (that is, August 1794), *assignats remained almost always at par*. The Maximum supported the assignat and gave it life; and the assignat, thus supported, confounded all timid reasonings, created almost incredible resources, nourished fourteen armies, and made the Republic strong enough to place her foot on royal Europe. It was only after the 9th Thermidor that the depreciation presented those characteristics which the detractors of the Revolution have not failed to attribute to an earlier period.' (xi. 414.)

We will not quarrel with the theories of our writer; but we believe him in this instance to be entirely misled as to the facts. We do not believe the Maximum had in truth anything whatever to do with the movement in the value of assignats. Louis Blanc is wrong, we think, in having fixed his attention on a very curious but temporary reflux in their value, which was occasioned by other causes—causes which his predecessor, Thiers, had expounded very clearly. The 'Maximum' lasted, at least on paper, from June, 1793, to October, 1794. In the earlier part of that period, Cambon and the Convention tried some bold measures to check the fall in the value of assignats; and a forced loan of a milliard, the severe collection of taxes, and above all a rise in men's spirits and in the funds, owing to the high popular courage and confidence engendered by a series of marvellous victories, did, for a short time, enable a great reduction in their number to be effected. But (to quote M. Charles Cochin, in his article 'Assignats' in the 'Dictionnaire d'Économie Politique') 'cette réduction ne fut pas de longue durée, et n'alla pas bien loin: bientôt les émissions recommencèrent, d'autant plus fortes que les assignats, de plus en plus dépréciés, représentaient une valeur moindre; au commencement de 1794' (and therefore in the very middle of the empire of the Maximum), 'le chiffre dépassait de nouveau 5 milliards,'—that is to say, it reached an equal height to the greatest attained *before* the Maximum. In June, just before the fall of Robespierre, the number was 6,536 milliards. (See also Louis Blanc himself, xii. 100.) The measure of the Maximum was therefore demonstrably insufficient to arrest their multiplication, and of course their depreciation.

But what if that measure had been maintained? Could so simple and severe a regulation have lived on in our artificial modern society? The true 'men of the Revolution,' says Louis Blanc, 'set themselves indeed in dogged opposition to the régime of "*laissez-faire*," and to that theory of the economists, in virtue

'of which the only regulation of price is the relation of demand to supply;' but they set themselves against it in vain, because they did not see far enough, and were not aware that their views, founded as they were in justice and in truth, could not coexist with those modern notions of property by which the boldest of them were still enslaved.

'They saw that the rule of unlimited competition offers no means of maintaining at the proper level the proportion between labour and capital; that it is in no degree in the power of the labourer, either to arrest the growth of population, and to prevent the fall of wages, or to direct towards production a larger portion of the national capital, and so to effect a rise in wages; that, consequently, the labourer has not the slightest control over those circumstances, on which nevertheless hang, as by a thread, his existence, and that of his wife and children; that, on the other hand, the action of demand and supply is confused, blind, the child of chance and night, no individual producer being able to know even approximatively the extent of the market, and the system of "*laissez-faire*" impelling every one to rush into it with his eyes shut, without troubling himself to find out whether there is room enough for new comers, and in the hope of expelling from it in any case some of those who have preceded him; at the risk of a glut of labour, an enormous waste of capital, and the placing "*en coupe réglée*" of poor labourers suddenly deprived of their daily bread.' (xi. 407.)

All this, and much more of the horrors of competition, described with equal eloquence, the philosophers of the Convention saw and would have prevented; but they did not estimate the resistance which the law of property, and the love of property, offered to their great reform.

'Their measures had the defect of being unable to coincide, except by the aid of violence, with a social order founded on the principle of "individualism," a principle opposed to that from which those measures derive their origin. They were accordingly *too much or too little*. . . . At the bottom, the idea of replacing the action of the relation of supply to demand by a scientific fixation of the remunerative price of every commodity, following out in their successive changes the variable elements of which this price is composed, implied a vast social revolution; and the authors of the Maximum were marching towards it, without knowing well to what end the road led which the Revolution had opened before them.'

And thus—if we may add our own commentary—the vast economical experiment of 1794 broke down precisely where the experiment of every little cooperative society is apt to break down: it was found that partial experiments in socialism are not practicable—that it cannot exist side by side with 'individualism.' The latter must be cleared out of the way, before the former can have a fair chance.

Such, in fact, is the practical conclusion, not only of this particular chapter, but of the whole work. Its author lives in the firm belief that the famous Revolution which he describes formed only a single stage in the great struggle of Equality against Privilege. He believes that the main reason of its temporary failure lay in the fact that none of its leaders—none save a few of its less important, but more far-seeing, supporters—rose to the real height of their great argument. They wanted political equality; they did much towards achieving it; but they did not perceive that it was unattainable except in company with Socialism. ‘La Révolution ne pouvait pas être, et n’a pas été, le point d’arrêt de l’esprit humain; elle n’a pas subitement rendu invariable ce monde moral qui, de même que le monde physique, se meut d’un mouvement éternel; elle nous a laissé en héritage un sol, indéfiniment fertile, à agrandir.’ Such are the words in which Louis Blanc may be said to resume the moral of his work.

We have ventured to speak of the short narrative entitled ‘*Les Dernières Heures de Louis XVI.*,’ as ‘ascribed to’ the Abbé Edgworth. It has been invariably received as his; and we should be sorry to arouse needless suspicion of one more mystification, in addition to the many contained in Revolutionary literature. But the circumstances are curious. The Abbé Edgworth de Firmont (i.e. of Firmount, County Longford) is made by lively French historians a legendary example of the pious, obscure anchorite, called from his cell to a great work. *Maleherbes*, says the romantic *Lamartine*, carried from the King ‘un message secret à un vénérable prêtre étranger, caché dans Paris. Il découvrit la demeure de ce guide de la conscience du roi, et lui fit parvenir la prière de son maître,’ and so forth. Who would conjecture, from his or any other French ‘history’ which we have seen, that this secluded saint was in truth an active ecclesiastic, of middle age, acting at the time as Vicar-General of the diocese of Paris, the most important post in the ‘refractory’ Church of France, and much consulted by Royalists in general?—that the King, in fact, when he asked for his assistance, prayed him, in case he declined on account of the danger, to select some clergyman ‘less known than himself’? But the abbé, though not the hermit he is usually painted, was an excellent and devoted man, one entirely absorbed in his duties, down to his death from hospital fever, taken in attending Napoleon’s wounded soldiers in Prussia, in 1807. Of himself and his own fame he had no thought, and scarcely seems to have realised the greatness of the scenes which he had witnessed.



He never published anything, nor left anything for publication. But after his death, his friends searched eagerly for almost every scrap of his correspondence which could be found, and printed these remains. Two documents only among them are of any general interest.

These are: First. A letter, in English, to his brother, Ussher Edgworth, dated London, September 1st, 1796, in which he gives an account of his own personal adventures and escapes in Paris during the Revolution. This letter was apparently destroyed by the receiver; but the Rev. Mr. England included it in the abbé's correspondence, which he published in 1819, from a transcript by the Rev. Dr. Moylan, R. C. Bishop of Cork. Independently of the respectable character of this authority, it carries strong internal evidence of genuineness, being full of Gallicisms, such as the abbé's style had naturally contracted from his long residence in France. In this letter he gives the usually-received account of his receiving a message to attend the King, and then proceeds as follows:—

‘Here, my dear Ussher, you will doubtless expect a full account of the most woful day that ever shined over France, and of the dismal night that preceded it. But part of this account, I suppose, is well known to you; and what still remains unpublished, I cannot commit to paper until I have seen the unfortunate remains of the Bourbon family, with whom I have never corresponded since.’

He then resumes his story at the moment when the King's head fell; describes his own descent from the platform of execution, and his subsequent adventures in France and flight from it.

Secondly. The narrative in French, commonly called the ‘*Dernières Heures de Louis XVI.*’ We have seen that the abbé delayed the composition of any record of the execution until he should have seen the royal family. This purpose he accomplished, joining them at Blankenburg, *not long after the date of the above letter.* And in April, 1799, he writes thus to Bishop Moylan from Mittau:—

‘Monseigneur Erskine is ill-informed. I have no publication in view. The little I can add to what has been printed over and over *is long ago in the hands of the King (Louis XVIII.)*, and of his brother. They are masters to make what use they please of my manuscript; but for my part, I shall publish nothing.’

It seems clear, therefore, that if the narrative is genuine, it must have been communicated to the public, directly or indirectly, by Louis XVIII. It was first published by the abbé's nephew, Charles Sneyd Edgworth, in 1815. He says that he copied it from a transcript in the British Museum. That tran-

script is still there. It professes to be taken from the abbé's MS. It is contained, with other pieces, in a large volume of calligraphic writing and designs in penmanship, purporting on the title-page to be the work of the Marquis de Sy, an emigrant noble. Some of the designs are portraits of members of the royal family, and ornamented with locks of their hair. The volume is magnificently bound, and stamped with the arms of France, and is enclosed in a table of peculiar construction, with the arms of the Marquis of Buckingham engraved on it. It is said to have come to the Museum from Hartwell. Nothing, certainly, seems more probable than that the use of the original MS. should have been permitted by Louis XVIII. to the loyal transcriber. But farther evidence there is none. And it is singular that although the letter which we have quoted, and the 'narrative,' scarcely cover two pages of the same ground, yet in so short a space there are several discrepancies. The letter mentions that the abbé received the message at five o'clock of the 20th of January—the narrative, at four. In the letter, the abbé says, 'As soon as the fatal blow was given, I fell upon my knees, and thus remained until the vile wretch who acted the principal part in this horrid tragedy came with shouts of joy, showing the bleeding head to the mob,' &c. In the 'Dernières Heures,' it is said, on the contrary, that 'le plus jeune des bourreaux (il ne semblait pas avoir plus de dix-huit ans) saisit aussitôt la tête, et la montra au peuple, en faisant le tour de l'échafaud.' In the 'Dernières Heures,' the abbé particularly mentions that Louis XVI., on the scaffold, recommended him, the abbé, to the care of two of the gendarmes; one of whom answered, "Oui, oui, nous en aurons soin; laissez-nous faire." In the letter, the abbé makes no mention whatever of the King's recommendation; but simply says, that finding himself left on the scaffold when the head fell, he endeavoured at once to pierce the crowd and escape. 'All eyes were fixed on me, as you may suppose; but as soon as I reached the first lines, to my great surprise, no resistance was made. The second line opened in the same manner,' and so forth. Differences of little importance, no doubt; and yet it is hardly natural that they should occur in two accounts composed by the same man, and almost at the same time. But, in addition to this, the 'narrative' seems to us to have a certain semblance of literary handling which is wanting in the letter. We offer these remarks as the more scruples of readers rendered perhaps over suspicious by the enormous amount of plausible fabrication which encumbers the materials of Revolutionary history. A little further inquiry might probably dissipate them.

**ART. V.—*A Dialogue on the Best Form of Government.* By the Right Honourable Sir GEORGE CORNEWALL LEWIS, Bart., M.P. London: 1863.**

**I**T is seldom that the title of a book prefixed to an article in this Review suggests reflections so mournful as those which will arise in the minds of our readers in connexion with this small volume. It may not be wonderful that the death of one who was a frequent contributor to these pages, and who himself for some time superintended their issue, should be a source of grief to scholars and literary men; but it is not often that the loss of the same man is at least as deeply felt by the Cabinet, the Parliament, and the people of Great Britain. Yet such is the case at the present moment. Whilst literature mourns an acute and accomplished scholar, the whole nation laments a statesman in whose good sense, sagacity, and integrity it could place implicit confidence. As the Dean of St. Paul's has truly said, in the graceful note prefixed to the recent edition of his '*History of the Jews*':—'It is rare that a man who might have aspired to the very highest dignity in the State might have done honour as professor of Greek to the most learned University in Europe.' It does not belong to us to dwell on the feelings of domestic sorrow, or the bitter regret of intimate friends, who know how he never failed in affection and considerate kindness for those immediately connected with him. Our present intention is to lay before our readers a concise account of this Dialogue, which was Sir George Lewis's last published work, and we hope to add a few words illustrative of his character and position. Any attempt at a biography (properly so called) would be out of place in these pages: the time has not yet come for such a work, and it would require materials of a different kind from those which are now before us.

The intention and form of this little book is best described in the author's own words. He says:—

'I have supposed the dialogue to take place in our own time and country, between four Englishmen, belonging to the educated class. My object has been to conceive each of the three recognised forms, Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Democracy, as represented by a sincere partisan, and to attribute to him such arguments as a judicious advocate might properly use. I have attempted, in discussion, to place each government in the light in which it would be regarded by an enthusiastic admirer, and to suggest all the strongest objections to the other governments which the advocates of each would naturally urge. My aim has been to conduct the controversy in such a manner

as to represent the strength of each case ; but I have not endeavoured to exhaust the subject. A dialogue is not fitted for systematic instruction, or for strict scientific treatment.' (P. vi.)

We think that Sir George Lewis has succeeded admirably in attaining the limited object which he had in view. The Dialogue is well written and well constructed, and the whole treatment of the subject is eminently characteristic of his fair and candid mind. It is probable that Crito, who opens the conversation, represents the author's own sentiments more nearly than any other speaker. He proposes the discussion, and at the same time questions whether there be such a thing as a best form of government in the abstract :—

'I cannot admit,' he says, 'that there is any one form of government which is best for every community under every variety of circumstances. Compare the useful arts. Can it be said that there is a best ship, a best gun, a best knife, a best spade, independently of all the various purposes to which these instruments can be applied? Why are we to suppose that one form of government is the best adapted for all communities, whatever their moral and intellectual state may be?' (P. 5.)

He then asks how the difference of race can be passed over ; and whether this abstract form of government is the best equally for all those who differ to the uttermost in civilisation and in origin? The supposed representative of each form replies by asserting that the particular government which he advocates is an end to be sought for its own sake and under all circumstances. Democraticus maintains that there are many sorts of bad government, but only one good government :—

ἐσθλοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἀπλῶς παντοδαπῶς δὲ κακοί.

Monarchicus undertakes to prove that a best form is not only possible, but actually exists, and he lays especial stress on what may be called the universality of monarchy, as a proof of its excellence. Aristocraticus reproaches him with calling those governments 'monarchies' which are in reality of another character, and thus claiming credit for what does not really belong to that form. He refuses, for instance, to allow that the government of England is properly called a 'monarchy,' and says 'it may not be a democratic republic, but it is a republic nevertheless. By a republic I understand every government 'in which the sovereign power is, both in form and in substance, distributed among a body of persons.' (P. 17.)

Monarchicus replies by pressing as the characteristic of sovereignty the civil and criminal irresponsibility of the king of England, and contrasting it with the position of a dege of

Venice or a republican president; and this limited question is argued with great force and ingenuity.

Monarchy is attacked as a rude and unimproved system of government characteristic of barbarism and social ignorance. The universal adoption of pure monarchy in the East is ascribed to the backward and stationary character of Oriental society, which is well, and in the main, truly stated.\* Aristocraticus contrasts with this the corporate or plural principle of government, for which he gives the Greeks credit as inventors. His opponent answers that there is no plural government without a decision by the majority, and that—

‘Decision by the majority is unquestionably one of the clumsiest contrivances for securing rectitude of decision which can be devised. You may talk of the rudeness of monarchical government, but I defy you to point out anything in monarchy so irrational as counting votes, instead of weighing them; as making a decision depend, not on the knowledge, ability, experience, or fitness of the judges, but upon their number. Nobody, in forming his individual opinion, ever resorts to such a test. No historian in commenting on the vote of an assembly, ever says, that the decision was made by the majority, and therefore it was right.’ (P. 33.)

The reply is, that decision by a majority is no doubt open to theoretical objections, but that it is the necessary condition of corporate government, and that corporate government is the only way of escaping from the perils of absolute sovereignty, with all its evils of occasional violence and assassination, and the corresponding cruelties on the part of a king who is in constant fear for his life. Monarchicus rejoins by referring to the cruelties of the Greek oligarchies and of ancient and modern democracies.

The evils and advantages of the rule of a single individual are then discussed, as well as those which attend on party government.

A very striking passage on the working of the old French Monarchy and its consequences is worth quoting at length. Aristocraticus is made to say :—

---

\* We are sorry that Sir George Lewis made Aristocraticus express in such very broad terms his contempt for Eastern literature. He was not himself an Oriental scholar, and it can be scarcely just to say ‘they have never produced any scientific or literary work worthy of mention, except the “Arabian Nights”’ (p. 29.). Our Sanscrit and Persian scholars must read these words with indulgence, and remember that they are put into the mouth of a professed advocate who is making out a case as shortly and as forcibly as he can, without dwelling on details or qualifying what he says.

'Hostility to the intellectual eminence, to the personal independence, and to the honest pride which ought to characterise every aristocracy is a natural attribute of an absolute monarchy; and it may accordingly be discerned among the various bad qualities of the old French government. The Monarchy of France, from Louis XIV. down to 1789, prevented the formation of a good aristocracy. It maintained the nobles in possession of their civil privileges; and at the same time, deprived them of political power. It preserved their exemption from direct taxes, and kept up the barriers between them and the *tiers-état*; it thus rendered them odious to the rest of the community. It hardened the mass of the people by its habitual severity, by its cruel punishments, and by its system of judicial torture, which were continued until the Revolution. The frightful punishment of Damiens was in 1757; the breaking of Calas upon the wheel took place in 1762; the horrible execution of the young Chevalier de la Barre occurred in 1766. The men who in July 1789, soon after the taking of the Bastille, murdered Foulon and his son-in-law, Berthier, in the streets of Paris; who hung them from lamp-posts, cut off their heads, and carried them on pikes, thrust Foulon's head in his son-in-law's face, tore out their hearts and entrails, and even devoured them from savage joy—these men had acquired their ferocity under the teaching of the old Monarchy; they had not learnt it in the school of Robespierre and Marat. Moreover, the old French Monarchy, by its frequent recourse to *coups d'état*, trained the people to a systematic disregard of fixed constitutional and legal rules. By this mode of government it prepared the way for the Revolution of 1789, and for Bonaparte, the two great scourges of modern Europe. The generation of Frenchmen which had grown up to manhood in the year 1789, was the creation of the old Monarchy, not of the Revolution. The Revolution was made by men whose character and opinions had been formed under the Monarchy, and who owed to it their training. If the French nobles had not been, by the short-sighted and selfish jealousy of the Monarchy, withdrawn from all political life, and from all the realities of business, they would not have shown the feebleness, the mutual mistrust, and the incapacity to combine, which characterised them, as a class, during the storms of the early part of the Revolution. Instead of emigrating, they would have organised a resistance to the Convention; acting as a body, they would easily have put down the handful of ruffians who worked the Paris guillotine during the Reign of Terror.'

It is not easy to sum up the indictment against the French Monarchy more completely and more forcibly than is done in this passage. The feebleness and incapacity resulting from it which marked the conduct of the nobles, was seen also in the fall of the Girondins. We confess that our pity for these men has always been blunted by the double consideration, that they had lent themselves to all the cruelty against the Royal Family, and that they exhibited in their fall the most contemptible want of

power to combine and avert their own fate. Monarchicus upholds Burke's view of the French Revolution, and attributes it to the writings of Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, and others. To this Aristocraticus replies that Rousseau's 'Contrat Social' certainly furnished the political creed of the Revolution, but that it was the Church which was the principal object of attack to writers such as the Encyclopédistes. Voltaire, for instance, was a professed admirer of the old Monarchy. He adds, that if Louis XVI. had had the force of character and the sagacity required for supporting Turgot in his reforms, he might have laughed at the Encyclopédie and the 'Contrat Social;' a proposition which we think very questionable, and which we may pause a little to consider.

Speculations as to what might have been the fate of France, if a different course had been pursued by her government, are curious and interesting. To go back even to an earlier period: if the Duke of Burgundy had lived, and the country had been spared the imbecility and profligacy of the Regent Orleans and of Louis XV.,—if States General had been summoned as St. Simon desired, and a sincere attempt made to infuse strength and honesty into the territorial aristocracy,—would it have been then too late to repair the mischief done by Louis XIV.? Even this may be doubtful, when we consider the wrongs inflicted on the Protestants, the religious discord which raged in the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church itself in the matter of the Jansenists, the centralisation of power by the Intendants in the provinces, and the utter prostration of the spirit of the nobles. In a letter written in 1840 Sir George Lewis said:—

'There is no doubt that the terror excited by the atrocities of the democratic and infidel party in the French Revolution has given great strength to the anti-popular and clerical party. Still, it is difficult to be too grateful for the utter annihilation of the old aristocratic institutions and opinions in France and a large part of Germany, and a peaceable reform would not have effected this. A peaceable reform in 1789 would probably have produced in France the same ultimate effect as the Revolution of 1688 in England. It would have curtailed the power of the king and the privileges of the nobles; and it would ultimately have transferred the governing power from the court to the territorial aristocracy.'

But the correctness of these last views appears to us very questionable, and it must be remembered that they were expressed before Tocqueville had thrown a flood of light on the real character of the old French Government. They are hardly perhaps consistent with our present knowledge on the subject.

We ourselves doubt whether any vigour on the part of Louis XVI., united even with the prescient intellect of Turgot, could have postponed the Revolution for long, though it might somewhat have moderated its violence. This violence indeed was greatly aggravated by the interference of foreigners. The pretext, and perhaps the cause, of the massacres of September was the necessity for striking terror into 'Pitt and Cobourg.' But we believe that the stream which finally burst over the precipice with such terrible fury, had long been pouring downwards with a deep and steady current, such as no virtue, or wisdom on the part of Louis XVI. could have barred or diverted.

We have mentioned Tocqueville's name: let us now quote from the argument of Aristocraticus a passage which contains a tribute to him, and expresses, briefly, the author's sentiments with reference to Napoleon:—

'Alas! poor Tocqueville! would that he had lived to execute his projected survey of Napoleon's policy. A history of Napoleon, affording a correct estimate of his character and influence, is the great desideratum of modern political literature; and no such work would produce any impression on the opinion of France, unless it were written by a Frenchman. An unfavourable judgment of Napoleon—the only judgment consistent with truth—would, if proceeding from an Englishman, be infallibly attributed to national prejudice and jealousy.' (P. 56.)

There follows in the Dialogue a most instructive discussion on the character of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the false position assumed by the English Tories under George III.: they are charged with betraying their own order and making themselves mere monarchists, when they 'were willing to lay 'the liberties of the country at the foot of the king.'

Up to this point the advocates of aristocracy and monarchy have been allowed to argue their respective cases one against the other; but now Democraticus comes forward, and whilst he concurs in all that Aristocraticus has urged against kingly power, calls on him to show why he would exclude the bulk of the people from all share in the government. The reply is that the models of ancient democracy were based on slavery as a necessary\* condition, and that stability and permanency have

---

\* Mr. Freeman, in his able work ('History of Federal Government,' 1863), says:—'The real special weakness of pure democracy is that it almost seems to require slavery as a necessary condition of its existence. It is hard to conceive that a large body of men, like the qualified citizens of Athens, can ever give so large a portion of their time as the Athenians did to the business of ruling and judging (ἀρχεῖν καὶ δικάζειν) without the existence of an



ever been the attributes of aristocratic governments, as in the cases of Sparta, Carthage, and Venice. The rejoinder is given that common plunder of the people no doubt secures harmony among the oppressors; but when they have become so strong as to fear no resistance from without, they quarrel among themselves, as the feudal barons of England and the free 'Ritterschaft' of the empire used to do. Democraticus alleges that the interests of the minority are separate from those of the community, and often hostile to them; that abuse of power by a minority is certain, and can only be prevented by vesting it in the people at large. His opponent grounds his exclusion of the working class from authority on their practical unfitness for its exercise, which is such as to require that they should be placed under tutelage. 'Moreover,' he adds, 'they are deficient in the proprietary feeling, which is one of the great safeguards of society.' The advocate of popular government on the other hand assumes that no credit must be given to any man for good intentions, and that the only security against the effect of sinister interests is the absence of power to do mischief.

We will now lay before our readers the arguments used by both disputants on the subject of the ballot:—

*'Aristocraticus.*—The expediency of the ballot, as a system of secret voting, now rests principally on the example of the Australian colonies. It is admitted that the American ballot is practically a system of open voting, and that in the American elections votes are not concealed. Now, I have no hesitation in saying that, in my opinion, the influence exercised at elections by the landlord over the tenant, by the employer over the workman, is one of the legitimate influences of property, and ought not to be disturbed. Like other moral influences, it may be abused; but public opinion is, in the long run, a sufficient safeguard against its abuse. It is one of the indirect

---

'inferior class to relieve them from at least the lowest and most menial duties of their several callings. Slavery therefore is commonly taken for granted by Greek political thinkers.' The author goes on to show, however, that slavery was no special sin of democracy in ancient times:—'it was an institution common to the whole ancient world, quite irrespective of particular forms of government.' (P. 38, note.) This last observation is quite true, but at the same time the objection to pure democracy remains unanswered; other forms might exist without slavery: pure democracy in the Greek sense could scarcely do so. The only possible solution of the difficulty is by means of a representative system, which virtually does away with the personal share of each citizen in the management of the government, and thus negatives those advantages of the direct political training of each individual citizen which are so much relied on by the advocates of the Athenian Agora.

means by which a preponderance is secured to intelligence in an electoral system, without resorting to the contrivance of plural votes.

*'Democraticus.*—I admire your candour in spurning all subterfuge, and in putting the aristocratic argument against secret voting on its true ground. I know of no legitimate influence of property, except its direct economical uses; I cannot consent that it should be employed for a political object. It seems to me to be sheer hypocrisy to give a man a vote and to deny him the only means by which he can obtain its full and free exercise. It is only by secret voting that the working classes can give a genuine expression to their opinions, and can secure the return of representatives really devoted to their interests.' (Pp. 83, 84.)

We have extracted this passage, not because we are about to enter on the discussion of the ballot, but because it affords a good example of the fairness and precision with which our author states a political issue. It is not necessary for our present purpose to follow closely the thread of the argument in the Dialogue; but it appears to us that more might be said by the supporter of democracy than Sir George Lewis has put into his mouth, especially with reference to the political education of the people. Aristocraticus maintains that the representative system is 'the philosopher's stone of politics,' and that it is essential the relation between the executive and the representative body should be well organised. The argument gradually passes on to the subject of the Government of the United States; and Democraticus attacks it thus:

*'The American plan*<sup>of</sup> *of electing an irremovable prime minister for a fixed term of four years, of making the cabinet ministers his clerks, and of excluding them from the legislative body, seems to me to be founded on a weak mistrust of the democratic influence. It is a contrivance, and a foolish contrivance, for counteracting the democratic tendency to changes, and for giving to the executive a stability with which, it is supposed, the pressure of democratic forces would be incompatible; but I do not share those apprehensions, and am quite willing that the prizes which can be safely contended for in England by a selfish aristocracy, should, under a democracy, be contended for by the representatives of the people at large, who must in general be actuated by pure and disinterested motives.'* (Pp. 90, 91.)

There is, we think, much good sense in this criticism of the American system, as viewed by a thorough and consistent advocate of democracy; and the passage which follows is still more important and interesting at the present moment. He goes on to say:—

*'Admiring as I do the character and opinions of the great men who founded the government of the United States, and believing that,*

up to the present deplorable division, it secured more happiness to the people than the government of any other country upon the earth, I yet cannot consent that democracy should be judged by the working of the American Constitution. The American Constitution is an intricate system, compounded of federal and state elements; the sovereignty is partitioned between the central federal power and the separate state governments. Both are indeed fashioned upon democratic principles; but the constant conflict between federal powers and state powers, and still more between federal interests and state interests, prevents the democratic element from having a perfectly free play. This conflict has been particularly manifested during the present civil war. If the United States had been a nation under a simple democratic government, the civil war would either never have arisen, or, if it had arisen, it would not have assumed such gigantic dimensions, and it would have been brought to an earlier termination. American politics have chiefly turned on a set of compromises between the North and the South, worked out through the medium of the Federal Government. These compromises have infected the whole public life of America, and have influenced the character and conduct of all its statesmen.' (Pp. 91, 92.)

The speaker then ascribes the low character of public men in America, not to 'the jealous and levelling spirit of democracy,' but rather to the working of the federal system, which he considers as the unsound part of the whole constitution.

We are rather disposed to agree with Aristocraticus in attributing this last defect to the 'Caucus system,' which pervades the action both of the federal and state governments. It is as if a body like the Marylebone Vestry were empowered to select the sovereign and the great functionaries. The conditions of popularity and the canvass for power are made distasteful in the highest degree to those who are highly educated and who possess means of their own. Full scope is given to such petty jealousies and enmities as attach themselves to every man of eminence or distinction in public life. The eyes of those who seek to lead the public are naturally turned to the men who, in mediocrity and narrowness of views, most resemble themselves. They are not only jealous of any superiority, but they fear that such superiority will enable a man to throw off the trammels of party and the influence which they hope to exercise over him when he is in office. They think that they themselves may thus fail to secure their share in the plunder which is distributed once in four years to the supporters of a new President and his ministry. The spirit of Ostracism becomes quickened by a sense of self-interest; and the result of the whole is what we now see exemplified—that the government of a great country, and the guidance of great armies, fall into the hands of the men who are least fitted for the charge of either.

We are well aware that it may be argued in reply, as it is by Democraticus, that the indirect effects of democratic universal suffrage are far more than a compensation for the disadvantage of second-rate rulers; and that its tendency to elevate the position and intelligence of the individual man makes up for these defects in administration; but it must be remembered that the existence of the body politic—that for the sake of which all government is valuable—is thus placed in perpetual peril.

Monarchicus interposes as the advocate of the federal principle. He says:—

‘It is an error to attribute the late secession to federalism. If the entire country from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico had been under a national government, the conflicts of interests between the North and South, and the differences on the subject of slavery, might equally have produced a separation and a rebellion.’ (P. 95.)

On this point we must pause a little, and offer some observations of our own.

Mr. Freeman, in the book to which we have already referred, has defined a federal commonwealth, in its perfect form, as one which is a single State in its relation to other nations, but which consists of many States with regard to its internal government. He says (p. 90.):—‘Federalism is essentially a compromise: ‘an artificial product of an advanced state of political culture.’

This is assuredly in one sense true, for the parts must exist before the whole can be constituted. Separate States must have been organised, considerable political experience acquired, and each must be in a condition to exercise, as a community, a free-will of its own, before they can combine, and agree on the conditions and modifications necessary to consolidate their union. In discussing the American question the same author admits that secession is the mildest form which rebellion can take, and that it is sometimes necessary; he says that, as the Federal Government is entitled to full obedience in its own sphere, the refusal of that obedience, whether by States or individuals, is essentially an act of rebellion. He adds, that a seceding State may be fully justified, but that it ought to be provided with at least as good a case as the original States had for their secession from Great Britain.\* But, together with these doctrines, Mr. Freeman admits that ‘a federation, though legally perpetual, is something ‘which is in its own nature essentially voluntary.’ He even says:—‘There is a sort of inconsistency in retaining members ‘against their will.’ Does it not almost appear that, on these

---

\* Freeman’s ‘History of Federal Government,’ pp. 116, 119.

principles, the question whether secession is or is not 'rebellion' becomes one purely of words? A rebellion, the repression of which by force is contrary to the essence of the supreme government, and which in itself may be justifiable, must, if there be any plausible cause at all, be 'rebellion' in the very mildest sense of the term. Who is to judge of the sufficiency of the cause?

We have thus referred to Mr. Freeman's views for the purpose of connecting them with the observation of Monarchicus, quoted a few pages back, to the effect that, if the United States had been a democratic nation, the war now raging would never have arisen. It is, indeed, quite clear that in such a case it could not have arisen in its present shape, and it is exceedingly probable it would never have broken out at all; but it becomes necessary here to reflect for a few moments on the origin and conditions of all Federal Governments.

No Federal Government which deserves the name has ever, we believe, been formed except for the purpose of resisting foreign aggression or external violence. The Achæan League was the result of the pressure of the Macedonian kings on Greece. The Swiss cantons united against their feudal neighbours, and against the power of Burgundy. Their union would have perished long ago, were it not that they are hooped together by the interests and mutual jealousies of European nations. The United Provinces became a Power for the purpose of resisting Spain and the House of Austria. The United States were driven to form their federal tie for the purpose of securing their freedom against George III.

Moreover, as foreign aggression and foreign wars have created all federal governments, so the fear of foreign aggression and foreign wars is, we fear, essential to their long-continued existence in their original shape. Look at the politics of America for the last fifty years. Whenever the body politic has been threatened with weakness or discord at home, the statesmen of the Union, with an instinctive sense of the fundamental principle of all federal governments, have always restored the tone of the constitution by the stimulating action of a foreign quarrel, actual or impending. Whenever the single States became troublesome, or domestic discord threatened to break out, some politician like Mr. Seward was ready to bid for popularity, and revive the failing sense of unity, by declaiming against the perfidy and insolence of England. The prospect of a foreign war, at however great a risk, has always been like a spark of life to the Union; and certainly, in reliance on our moderation, the remedy has been at all times unsparingly and unscrupulously administered.

Now, if such be the origin and such the vital principle of all federal governments, we are tempted to ask, in the first place, whether that class of governments is to be looked on as the most mature product of political wisdom, which requires the constant pressure or threat of foreign aggression as the condition of its lengthened life? In the second place, we think that it becomes easy to see why secession (or rebellion) should be constantly apprehended under a Federal system, and why such secession, whatever may be its technical character, must differ in its moral aspect from rebellion against a national government.

What are the great safeguards against rebellion and tumult in a State such as France or Prussia? In the first place, no doubt, there is always the dread of the material force wielded by those who administer the existing Government; but, behind this, there is a stronger sentiment, which makes a would-be rebel hesitate to rely on the support of the people around him. There is the fear of anarchy on the part of the rich and the middle classes—the dread that when the Government which exists, bad as it may be, is broken up, all that men care for will be cut adrift and floating in confusion on a troubled sea. It is felt that security of life and property is bound up with the existence of laws and of the tribunals which administer them. A peaceable citizen must, in general, be stimulated by atrocious tyranny, before he runs the risk of the plunder and bloodshed which may probably follow rebellion.

But is this so in the case of a Federal Government? By no means. Each State is an organised community, with its own laws, its own administration, and its own courts. If the Federal capital, the President, Congress, and the Federal army, were to be swallowed up by an earthquake, each State of the Union might transact its own business and carry on its own industry just as if nothing had happened. Secession, whether it be technically 'rebellion' or not, implies in itself none of those internal dangers and risks which necessarily attend on rebellion in a centralised State. It does not involve anarchy, because each State possesses in itself all the machinery of government, which has in fact regulated the daily life of its citizens while it remained a member of the Federation. The safeguards of life and property will, so far as internal danger is concerned, be neither less nor more after secession than they were before it. We do not say that these considerations as to the real origin and principle of federal government, and the consequences of 'rebellion,' justify the secession of the South; they may do so, or they may not, but they appear to us to account

for many phenomena, and *morally* they place the separation of a State from a federation in a very different light from the insurrection of a province against a national government.

With reference to this whole subject, we are permitted to insert here an extract from a most interesting letter of Sir George Lewis, written in July 1856. It is curious to see how distinctly he then appreciated the relative position of the different sections of the American Union:—

‘Dana’s lecture on Sumner is very interesting. It illustrates the relations of the South and North, and their feelings to one another. People here speak of the outrage on Sumner as a proof of the brutal manners of the Americans, and their low morality. To me it seems the first blow in a civil war. It betokens the advent of a state of things in which political differences cannot be settled by argument, and can only be settled by force. If half England was in favour of a measure which involved the confiscation of the property of the other half, my belief is that an English Brooks would be equally applauded. If Peel had proposed a law which instead of reducing rents had annihilated them, instead of being attacked by a man of words such as Disraeli, he would probably have been attacked with physical arguments by some man of blows. I see no solution of the political differences of the United States, but the separation of the Slave and Free States into distinct political communities. If I was a citizen of a Northern State I should wish it. I should equally wish it if I was a citizen of a Southern State. In the Northern States the English race would remain unimpaired: but I cannot help suspecting that it degenerates under a warmer sun, and that a community formed of Anglo-Saxon masters within the tropics and of negro slaves would degenerate. I see no reason why the pure English breed should not be kept up in the Northern Provinces and the Northern States. It may also be kept up in Australia, which has a climate suited to our race, and has fortunately been kept untainted by the curse of coloured slavery.’

A similar view of the subject is expressed in a later letter (November 5th) of the same year, 1856:—

‘The United States seem to me to have come nearer to a separation of North and South than they ever were before. I take for granted that Buchanan will win. The Southern States are thoroughly in earnest. They are fighting for their property. The Northern States have only a principle at stake; they will be less united and less eager. At the same time it is not at all clear that they can continue to form one State, or rather one political body; and they may reach a point when, like a married couple who cannot agree, they may part by common consent. Each may find his account in a separation.’

At a much later time (May 15th, 1861), he wrote as follows:—

'The Northern States have drifted or rather plunged into war without having any intelligible aim or policy. The South fight for independence, but what do the North fight for, except to gratify passions and pride? — in his curious letter talks of averting anarchy, but if the North had remained quiet they had nothing to fear from anarchy.'

In an earlier letter of the same year, before the war had broken out, he said:—

'The refusal of Tennessee and Arkansas to join the new confederacy may give some hopes of a compromise, but I cannot see how it can be expected that men who have committed themselves so far as the leaders of the Secession movement, can be expected to come back, except upon such terms as they themselves would dictate. They would not only lose their present position, but they would scarcely be safe from proscription, if they acquiesced in the reestablishment of the old Union, and thus to a certain extent put themselves in the power of a republican executive.'

We must return for a moment to the Dialogue; but it is only for the purpose of laying before the reader an extract from the concluding speech of Crito, which is most characteristic of the author's calm moderation and cautious good sense:—

'I am so unfortunate as to be unable to agree altogether with any one of you. I must hold to my original faith as to the impossibility of establishing any best form of government, applicable to all communities. But difficult as I must maintain it to be, to mould any constitution of government upon an ideal standard, without reference to existing circumstances and historical associations—unless, indeed, the conditions necessary for permanence are disregarded—yet I am conscious that legislative science has made great progress, and that the labours of jurists and political economists have furnished the statesman with a large number of true general principles, which, if properly converted into maxims or rules of conduct, and applied to facts, will lead to some practical conclusions.

'If we take any particular department of legislative science—such as criminal law, education, relief of the poor, finance, trade, public works, military and naval organisation—we shall find that theoretical writers have established many good general principles, which will guide the path of the statesman, and which he will be able with advantage to apply in practice. But when we ascend above these departments, and arrive at the abstract question, what is the best form of government for all communities? it seems to me that we are attempting the solution of an insoluble problem. . . .

'But even if I were to decide in favour of one of these forms, and against the two others, I should not find myself nearer the solution of the practical problem. A nation does not change its form of government with the same facility that a man changes his



coat. A nation in general only changes the form of its government by means of a violent revolution.' (Pp. 113-5.)

We think that the reader will have learnt from us enough of this thoughtful and interesting little book to tempt him to its perusal. It will suggest for his reflection far more than is presented by its pages.

We now turn to consider shortly the career and character of Sir George Lewis as a politician and a scholar. We cannot add to his well-deserved reputation, or do justice to his merits, but this Review is the last work in which these merits should be unnoticed, or his death unlamented.

He was descended from an old family in Radnorshire, who are mentioned as early as the middle of the fifteenth century. One of them was sheriff for that county in the reign of Edward VI. Another held the same office in 1658 and 1659. Thomas Lewis of Ilarpton represented the Radnorshire boroughs for fifty-three years, that is from 1715 to 1768. It is scarcely necessary to speak of the merits of Sir Frankland Lewis, who sat for the same boroughs, and who received a baronetcy in 1846. His eldest son was born in 1806. Having passed through Eton he became a member of Christ Church, Oxford, of which body he was an honorary student at the time of his death.

When he was a young man great fears were entertained for his health, and precautions were taken against pulmonary weakness by sending him to a warmer climate. On one of these occasions he formed the idea of writing his excellent little book on the Romance Languages, of which a new edition has lately appeared. When it was first published there was no work on the subject familiarly known to the English reader: even now it is difficult to name another in our own language, although much has been done by Diez and others on the continent of Europe. In 1830 Mr. Lewis attended the lectures on Jurisprudence, delivered by Mr. John Austin at the London University, in a class which comprised the present Master of the Rolls, Mr. John Mill, and other distinguished men. The vigour and clearness of Mr. Austin's mind acted powerfully on that of his pupil, and had, we have no doubt, great influence in forming his habits of thought. In 1832 he conducted an important inquiry into the condition of the Irish Poor in England. In 1836 Mr. Austin and Mr. Lewis were associated in a commission of inquiry into the affairs of Malta, where they resided for some time.

We give the following extracts from letters written from that island at the close of the year 1836 and the beginning of 1837,

because they are interesting in themselves, and because they convey an idea of the writer's correspondence:—

‘At Marseilles we embarked on board a frigate, which had come from Smyrna and therefore subjected us to the necessity of performing quarantine on our arrival at Malta. I found it a great mistake to suppose that there is no motion in large ships; a small vessel has moreover this advantage, that it is worked without there being a crew of 450 men to walk over one's head during the chief part of the night. We had all kinds of foul winds and calms, and were ten days in reaching Malta. We saw the southern point of Sardinia, the north-west coast of Sicily, and a part of the coast of Africa near Cape Bon. We also remained about two days in sight of a hateful little island called Pantellaria.

‘Valetta is on the whole the most striking and beautiful town I ever saw: the indentations of the harbour, the extent and grandeur of the fortifications and their combination with the rock, and the terrace-like arrangement of the houses, form a collection of objects such no town that I know can equal. It resembles Edinburgh in some points—viz. the mixture of buildings and rock, and the rising of the streets in stories over one another. In other respects it is, of course, very different.

‘The French, of course, did much mischief in Malta, as in all other places which they occupied: among other things they stripped the leaden roof off the “*Baraccas*”—large porticoes in which the knights used to walk in hot weather. They now serve for the same purpose in cold weather, as their uncovered walls exclude the wind while they admit the sun.

‘We found ourselves on our arrival much to our surprise floating down the tide of popularity. We made a sort of triumphal entry (though against our will) into the town. The streets were thronged all night, and we were annoyed with all kinds of marks of respect. This state of things however has not been of long duration, and we are already beginning to think of rotten eggs and dead cats. The people evidently thought, or were told, that we came out with a Maltese Magna Charta in our pockets; and when we summoned the chief complainants, and began to talk of inquiry, they were manifestly quite surprised, and seemed to think that we had merely to give a grind or two, and out would come a whole code of laws ready made. After three days of inane declamation on the part of the complainants, and of “damnable iteration” on our part, they have at last begun to perceive that it will be necessary for us to investigate a subject before we report on it, and that in order to investigate we must take evidence. This sequence of propositions, which in England may seem tolerably clear, has only become manifest to our gentlemen by means of a long succession of the severest intellectual throes. It would have edified you to see the gravity which we maintained during the most ludicrous parts of the touching patriotic pathos addressed to us. I have seen Hookham Frere, who found himself in Malta fourteen years ago at his

wife's death, and has forgotten to return to England. He has translated four plays of Aristophanes, and will, I imagine, publish them.

'There is nothing in this island either ancient or remarkable in the way of art. The knights appear to have thought of nothing but building new forts, and enlarging the defences of Valetta. They have been so successful in this ambition, that the very extent of the fortifications is a source of weakness, inasmuch as it would take 20,000 men to man the works, if the town were regularly invested. This contingency, however, is most improbable, one may say almost impossible, so long as England retains the command of the sea. Nevertheless, the Ordnance are not satisfied unless they keep the place in a perpetual state of siege; and I hear that orders have lately come out from England to cut down some mulberry trees in one of the ditches. A well-fortified town may be an excellent contrivance in time of war, but it is an excessive inconvenience in time of peace. It takes between a quarter and half-an-hour of walking through narrow gates, and across ditches, and up steep steps, and under covered ways, to get clear of the defences, whenever one wishes to breathe some air. You can conceive Ehrenbreitstein on the scale of a town large enough to contain 50,000 people.

'The native language of the Maltese is an Arabic dialect, which agrees pretty nearly with the Arabic spoken on the coast of Barbary, as far as Egypt. It has never been written and cannot even be said to have an alphabet. There are not, as far as I am aware, any literary compositions in it preserved by tradition.

'The people are an Arab race descended from the Saracens who obtained possession of the island. Their physiognomy bears a striking resemblance to the Jewish. They are a gloomy people; they never seem to laugh, or sing, or dance; their amusements, if such they can be called, are of a religious cast, such as processions on saints' days, &c. I hear that the country people pass the chief part of their Sundays and "*giorni di festa*" in the churches. They are exceedingly ignorant; and not unnaturally, as there has been no education for the poor, very little for the rich, and no free press. They are, however, by no means wanting in acuteness and ability. Their *practical talent* is, indeed, remarkable; and in this respect they appear to great advantage even by the side of the English, who (with their descendants) exceed all other nations in this quality. There is a pernicious race of nobles, who transmit their titles to all their sons, together with fortunes varying from 500*l.* to 40*l.* or 50*l.* a year, and a self-imposed inability to follow any money-making occupation. These people are ignorant, narrow-minded, stupid, and rapacious of public money; and it would be well if their titles could be abolished. As, however, they are now excessively poor, and they have no means of recruiting their fortunes by rich marriages, a few more descents, and divisions of property, must confound them with the middle and working classes. There is also a numerous body of priests, more than 1,000 (including the regulars) to a population of 120,000. The priests are for the most part

bigoted and ignorant; but their influence has considerably declined of late years, and their incomes are most pitiful, varying from 10*l.* to 30*l.* or 40*l.* a year. The merchants, the advocates, the doctors, and the government employés form the really valuable part of the population. The misery which prevails among the mass of the people is caused by the excess of their numbers. The great and unnatural commerce drawn into Malta by the Berlin and Milan decrees gave a stimulus to population, and also accustomed the working classes to a higher standard of living, from which they have now fallen.'

In a subsequent letter (October 3, 1837) the writer says:—

'The government has lately been making some changes in their charitable institutions, which we had recommended. The expenditure in charities is now 16,000*l.* a year out of a revenue of less than 100,000*l.* One of the institutions which we recommended to be gradually abolished was what in Italy is called a "Conservatorio," that is a charity boarding-school for girls, who remain in it till they can get places or are married. On examining the girls in the conservatorio somewhat more closely than had hitherto been done, it has recently turned out that, although they have been regularly taught to read Italian, they never learnt the meaning of the words; and although there are some (who have been undergoing this process for several years) who can pronounce Italian to perfection, they cannot understand or speak a word of it. I hope this is not the way in which English is taught in Welsh schools.'

By its results, the Malta Commission, although it was unjustly and unwisely derided in England at the time, entirely justified the policy of the Government and the prevision of the eminent men by whom these measures were recommended. The administration of Malta, since it had passed into the hands of Great Britain, was the military discipline of a fortress engrafted on the obsolete legislation and ordinances of the Knights of St. John. The people were impoverished and discontented; the taxes onerous; and the rights of the Maltese overridden by English authority. These grievances were removed by the juridical wisdom of Mr. Austin and by the practical sagacity of Mr. Lewis; and we remember to have heard one of the most distinguished members of the Maltese bar observe, many years afterwards, that there has seldom been an instance in which a well-considered scheme of reform has so effectually fulfilled the intentions of its authors and the hopes of the people.

In 1838 Mr. Lewis succeeded his father as one of the commissioners under the Poor Law Amendment Act. What his ability and honesty were in the administration of this department can be known only by those who worked with him and under him; but there was at least one eminent statesman who fully appreciated these qualities. We know no point in

which Sir James Graham showed his acuteness and sagacity in judging of men more clearly than in his estimate of Mr. Lewis. In 1841 Sir James came into office as Home Secretary. He had a certain temptation from party motives, and from the fact that the topic had been largely used on the hustings by his supporters, to cavil at, perhaps to interfere with, the administration of the Poor Law. He had moreover, as we believe, rather a prepossession against Mr. Lewis, of whom he knew little or nothing. He took a certain time to satisfy himself as to the qualifications of those who were then at the head of the department: he tested them by requiring explanations and reports on all cases which arose, and abstained entirely from confidential communications with them. After this time, however, had elapsed he made up his mind as to Mr. Lewis's ability and trustworthiness, and at once placed unreserved confidence in him. Many years afterwards he seemed to exult in the foresight which had led him thus to appreciate Mr. Lewis's high qualities, and in 1857, he observed, with a sort of pride, to one who knew all the circumstances, that 'Lewis was Chancellor of the Exchequer!' as if his elevation to that high post confirmed the anticipations formed by himself so long before.

After the change in the Poor Law Commission, Mr. Lewis became secretary to the Board of Control, and held other offices. He sat for Herefordshire, but at a subsequent general election lost his seat for that county, mainly on the ground of the Corn Laws. He was afterwards defeated at Peterborough, and after his father's death, although quite satisfied with the tranquillity of a literary life, and perhaps unwilling to embark again in politics, he obtained the seat for the Radnorshire boroughs which his father and his ancestors had often held before. How he discharged his duty as their representative, and what were his merits as a landlord and a friend, is best shown by the feeling now exhibited in his own county and in Herefordshire—a feeling such as to overpower all discrepancy of political party. He accepted the editorship of this Review on the death of Mr. Empson at the close of the year 1852, and conducted it successfully until he became Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1855. In 1853 he had been offered the Government of Bombay, and wrote thus in relation to it:—

'India is an interesting field, especially at the present moment; but it would have cut short a great many threads which I have begun to spin. I therefore remain constant to the "Edinburgh Review," and am just about bringing out another number.'

The reader will, we are sure, peruse with interest the following extract from another of his private letters, dated

March 18th, 1855, with reference to his acceptance of the post of Chancellor of the Exchequer:—

‘Events have succeeded one another so closely with me of late, that I really have had no time to write to you. Soon after my return to London after my election, I received quite unexpectedly the offer of the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer in Lord Palmerston’s Government. I had just returned from the country: I had had no time to look into my private affairs since my father’s death. I had not even proved his will. I had the “Edinburgh Review” for April on my hands, and the last part of my volumes on the Roman History. I had been out of Parliament for two years, and I did not know the present House of Commons. I had to follow Gladstone, whose ability had dazzled the world, and to produce a war budget with a large additional taxation in a few weeks. All these circumstances put together inspired me with the strongest disinclination to accept the offer. I felt, however, that in the peculiar position of the Government, refusal was scarcely honourable, and would be attributed to cowardice, and I therefore most reluctantly made up my mind to accept. I remembered the Pope, put in hell by Dante,

“Che fece per viltade il gran rifiuto.”

‘My re-election passed off without difficulty. I went down to Harpton for two nights and made a speech in the Town Hall at Radnor. Since my return to London I have been engrossed with the business of my office, and have hardly had a moment to spare. There is an awkward question about the newspaper stamp, which I have had to plunge into. There are also all the preparations to be made for the impending budget, and measures to be taken for providing sufficient sums to meet the enormous extraordinary expenditure which the war in the Crimea is causing. Gladstone has been very friendly to me, and has given me all the assistance in his power.’

To all who knew Sir George Lewis well the extracts from these two letters will appear most characteristic: they will know that the simplicity with which he comments on his refusal of the Indian Government, and states his embarrassment at the offer of the Chancellorship of the Exchequer, is of a piece with the whole tone of his feelings: in any other man affectation might be suspected, but in him it was impossible. It is, we believe, well known that when the present Government was formed, Sir George Lewis did not allow the claim which he had for his former office to interfere with the formation of a strong and effective Cabinet; although it was not forgotten that his qualities as a Finance Minister were of the highest order, and had commanded the respect and confidence of the city, during his tenure of the Exchequer, to a remarkable degree.

His principle was, that any man who embarked in public life ought to take that office which, in the opinion of his colleagues, he could hold with most advantage to the Government and the country. In whatever position he was placed, his sole thought was what he could do for the office and the public—not what the office could do for him. This entire forgetfulness of self—this absolute indifference to the common incentives of vanity, profit, or ambition, marked to an unexampled degree the character of Lewis. He brought into public life no irritability, and no envy. His habit was to dismiss, as unworthy of his notice, those adventitious circumstances which are apt to magnify political questions by personal pretensions; and to perform simply his duties, in whatever relation he might stand, to the service of the Crown. Thus it was that on the lamented death of Lord Herbert of Lea, Sir George Lewis consented to pass from the Secretaryship of State for the Home Department to that of War, although the latter office was evidently the office least congenial to his own studies and pursuits. By a melancholy coincidence, this same office of War has twice been vacated since the formation of the present Administration, by the death of two of the most efficient members of it!

Indeed, the striking feature of his character in politics, in literature, and in private life was this honest and straightforward simplicity. Trick or contrivance of any kind was so utterly alien from his nature as never to cross his thoughts. He never suffered party or personal motives to taint or warp his judgment on any question, whether of literature or state-manship. He would not have thought of outwitting an opponent in public life by subterfuge or stratagem, any more than he would have tampered with a Greek quotation for the purpose of supporting a favourite philological theory. There is a passage in the preface to the little Dialogue now before us, which, like the whole tone of the book, marks well the fair and deliberate character of his mind. He says:—

‘It is a controversy consisting of a debtor and creditor account; the difficulty lies in striking the balance fairly. The weights in one scale may be less heavy than the weights in the other scale, but they are nevertheless weights. Such is the nature of nearly all moral and political problems.’ (P. vii.)

This is no doubt an obvious truth; but there are few men who practically keep this truth before them to the same extent as the author himself did. He never failed to take ‘a weight’ into account because it was offered to him by an opponent, though he might differ as to the proper value to be assigned to it. Personal feelings and personal enmity had as little to do

with his opinions or conduct as personal interest. He rarely formed an opinion without looking at all sides of the question before him; and without having recourse to all accessible sources of information, which he knew where to find better than most men. He was deluded by no prejudices and jumped at no conclusions, without testing them by the application of sound common sense. When he had thus formed an opinion, he adhered to it steadily, but not obstinately. He was always open to argument, and he never refused to listen to it because it conflicted with his own view of the case. We cannot confirm these last assertions better than by inserting the following extract from a letter written after his death by a highly cultivated and intelligent American to a friend in England, and received whilst this article is in our hands:—

‘I knew him but little, but there was one quality in his mind of vast consequence to him as a statesman, and to his country, which was quickly apparent; I mean his *instinctive* fairness. He was singularly able and willing to change his opinion, when new facts came to unsettle his old one. He seemed to do it too without regret. This struck me the first time I saw him, which was at breakfast at Lord Stanhope’s in July 1856, and it was still more strongly apparent the next morning at breakfast at his own house, the conversation on both occasions having been much on American affairs, at the period just before Buchanan’s election, and when Walker was making his wild filibustering attempts on the isthmus. And so it continued, I think, every time I saw him that summer and the next, down to the last dinner at his house, when we were together. I remember I used to think he had the greatest respect for *facts* of any man I ever saw, and an extraordinary power of determining from internal evidence what were such. I suppose this meant that the love of truth was the uppermost *visible* quality in his character.’

Above all, his temper in private and in public life was calm and unruffled, and he bore no malice against any man. All his instincts and leanings were on the side of gentleness and humanity, but without any taint of morbid sensitiveness. He felt strongly the misery of others, but he never permitted feeling to weigh down reason in the discussion of practical measures. With all this he was conciliatory in his demeanour, and his frankness and openness were the genuine results of his personal character. Office made no change in him. With his old friends he ever remained the same, for his affectionate and kindly nature was unaltered by his accession to the highest place. The scholar and the man of letters with whom he had discussed a point of philology or history always found the same ready attention and the same free intercourse of thought, as if he had still been exclusively occupied with subjects common to both of



them. His keen sense of humour and his genial disposition made his society delightful to those who knew him well. Nor did he show any indisposition to mix in conversation or ordinary talk of a light and humorous kind. His own relaxation, indeed, from the cares of office was a return to studies apparently to many men the most dry and uninviting, but which were to him a source of constant enjoyment. Within a few months of his death he beguiled the tedium of a temporary illness by reading the Greek tragedians with the keenest delight, in the intervals of pain; this indeed other scholars might have done, but few would have sought recreation after the labours of the Home Office and of Parliament in writing the 'History of Ancient Astronomy.' Every moment was occupied, and his industry was unceasing, so that it may truly be said, few men have lost so little time between their births and deaths. It should be added that he was singularly methodical in the arrangement of his papers and correspondence.

As a public man, his loss is one of the greatest which the country could have sustained. He was listened to with attention in Parliament, not because he was eloquent, but because he never spoke except when he had something to say. He always expressed sincerely and plainly a view of the subject under discussion, which was the result of information and inquiry, digested by common sense and entire honesty of purpose. A good example of the value of his Parliamentary powers may be found in his speech on criminal appeals. There was, moreover, in his mind no tendency to exaggeration of any kind. He never knowingly over-estimated a danger or an advantage, and his wishes and sentiments were evidently controlled by his fairness and his reason. This was especially visible in the consideration of questions connected with the present crisis in America, on which he spoke his mind freely and courageously when he thought there was a danger of precipitate action on our part.

We have left ourselves but little space to dwell on the literary labours of Sir George Lewis, numerous and important as they are. It is not our intention to pass judgment on his writings, or to discuss them critically. Many of them indeed have already been the subjects of articles in this Review and in other periodicals. We begin with those of his productions which appeared as distinct works. His book on the Romance Languages has already been mentioned: a second edition of it was called only a short time before his death. The original work was reviewed in the sixty-second volume of this Journal. In 1836 he published a book on Irish Disturbances and the Irish Church. In 1839,

Mr. Murray printed an excellent little glossary of words used in Herefordshire and the adjoining counties, which was put together entirely by him. In 1841 appeared a volume on the Government of Dependencies, which was noticed in the eighty-third volume of the 'Edinburgh Review.' Mr. Parker, of Oxford, published in 1846 his edition of the 'Fables of Babrius;' the work of a finished scholar. His 'Essay on the Influence of Authority in matters of Opinion,' printed in 1849, was reviewed by a distinguished contributor to this Journal in our ninety-first volume. The following extract from a letter of the author written in that year, is characteristic and interesting, inasmuch as it shows how little he looked to the temporary popularity of his writings:—

'I thought I had mentioned to you some time ago that I was writing on the subject of Authority. My book has been favourably reviewed in the "Examiner," "Athenæum," and some other newspapers; and nearly 230 copies have been sold, which, as the subject is not a very attractive one, and the mode of treatment is not intended to be popular, is quite as much as I could hope for.'

In the same letter he stated that he was meditating a work on the Methods of Political Reasoning, which would take him several years, if he was ever able to complete it. His idea was that such a book would dispose of a host of political speculations, by showing that the method of reasoning on which they were founded was radically unsound, without separately refuting the conclusions of each author. This book appeared in two volumes in 1852, under the title 'A Treatise on the Methods of Observation and Reasoning in Politics.' It is not surprising that a philosopher who writes on the theory of such subjects has shown that he himself is capable of applying that theory successfully in public life.

In November 1854 he thus described the object and character of his forthcoming work on Roman History:—

'I have been engaged at review work, and in revising my book on Roman History, and getting it through the press, which is very tedious work, on account of the number and length of the notes. I expect to complete the printing of the first volume (above 500 pages) by the beginning of next month. My criticism is purely negative. I set up nothing of my own. One of my objects is to show that Niebuhr's reconstructive theories are untenable, as well as the accounts which he sets aside.'

In a later letter he said:—

'I have been working steadily at my Roman History, and been following Niebuhr through all his wonderful perversions and distortions of the ancient writers.'

This book was reviewed in the 104th volume of our Journal by a living historian of acknowledged eminence. The first extract given above is extremely important, because it defines accurately the negative character of the work, which has been by the Germans accounted its defect, but which in our opinion is its great and paramount excellence. Sir George Lewis may possibly be wrong in underrating the amount of historical evidence which existed at Rome in the days of Pyrrhus, but the principle against which he has contended is the one usually acted on by the German writers in dealing with such subjects. If the details of a history are incredible in themselves, or supported by insufficient testimony, a German historian will assume the duty, first, of sweeping away the old narrative, and then framing a new scheme or theory of his own, which has no foundation to rest on except those very authorities whose credibility he has destroyed. Thus, as it has been well put in a memorandum before us—

‘Mommesen, who does not recognise at all the history of the kingly period, and does not mention the names of the kings except incidentally, still relates the amalgamation of the Palatine and Quirinal cities, and describes at length the earliest constitution, according to his own ideas; though the only materials which he possesses for such a reconstruction are the very authorities whom he regards as untrustworthy. Against this system Lewis strongly protests. He refuses to believe an event unless certified by the testimony of credible witnesses: He will not reject, for instance, the history of Servius Tullius, and yet accept the Servian constitution as an enactment of that king. He denies the right of a historian to proceed upon internal probability when all evidence is wanting. This demand for strict evidence is distasteful to most men. Thus Mommesen, in conversation in England, complained that Lewis treated Livy as a policeman treats a criminal—drags him, as it were, into court, and causes him to be questioned as to the evidence for each fact.’

It is truly added by the writer of the passage just quoted, that when a man of Mommesen’s eminence complains of such reasonable rigour, the corrective influence of sound English sense on the treatment of history did not come too soon. Sir George Lewis’s book has been translated into German and has reached a second edition in that country, and more copies of the translation have been sold probably than of the original work. We trust the scholars of that country will profit by the lessons which it inculcates.

The ‘History of Ancient Astronomy’ has appeared so recently that we need only mention it, more especially as it was reviewed in the 116th volume of this Journal. Fault

has been found with the sweeping character of Sir George Lewis's criticisms in this work on the interpretation of hieroglyphics and the cuneiform inscriptions. It may be that his want of Oriental scholarship makes his observations on this subject of less value than his judgments on such matters in general, but we think that the difficulties stated in the sixth chapter respecting the interpretation of an unknown language written in an unknown character, and the fallacious analogy of such a process to that of deciphering, require yet to be answered fully and completely, if any such answer can be given. Sir George Lewis may have underrated the exact amount of what has been done, but his arguments are such as ought to make us, in all such cases, require the most stringent proof. The little *jeu d'esprit* published by him last year was intended to apply more particularly to the attempts to interpret the inscriptions in the old languages of Italy and Assyria, and it is excellent in its way. The thought of a serious work on this subject had long before crossed his mind. So far back as 1858 he said, in writing to a friend:—

'I am thinking of writing an essay to prove the recent German attempts to interpret the Euboean tables and other Italian inscriptions in unknown tongues to be frivolous and vexatious.'

We have omitted to mention that English scholars owe to our lamented friend the translations of Müller's *Dorians* (executed jointly with Mr. H. Tufnell), and of the same writer's '*History of Greek Literature*,' as well as of Bocckh's '*Public Economy of Athens*.'

But Sir George Lewis's literary activity, and his influence on scholarship, history, and philosophy would be very imperfectly estimated by a reference to his larger works alone.

In the year 1831 or 1832, the periodical called '*The Philological Museum*' was started at Cambridge by the present Bishop of St. David's, the late Archdeacon Hare, and others. Sir George Lewis was an early contributor. His first paper is, we believe, a short review of Goettling's edition of Aristotle's *Politics*. This was succeeded by an article on Babrius; then followed a notice of a blunder made by the *Journal of Education* in confounding the lot in Greek elections with the ballot; and a paper on English Diminutives. The second volume contains a review of Arnold on the Spartan Constitution; a discussion on English Preterites and Genitives; and some observations on Micali's '*History of the Ancient Nations of Italy*'—all by him. The circulation of the '*Philological Museum*' was a limited one, and it was given

up in 1833. In 1844, Sir George Lewis assisted in starting the 'Classical Museum,' to which he was a contributor for some time. Among his papers in this journal there was one on Xenophon's Hellenics, another on the English verb 'to thirl,' and a curious note on some remarks of Napoleon on the Siege of Troy. To the 'Law Magazine,' then so ably conducted by Mr. Hayward, he contributed largely, and some of his articles are of great and permanent value. Among them were several on Secondary Punishments, and more than one paper on the Penitentiary System; one at least on Presumptive Evidence, another on Capital Punishments, and one on the Trial of La Roncière. More recently he published in a separate form an Essay on the Extradition of Criminals, in which he discussed, with great legal acuteness, the conflicts of jurisdiction which have on several recent occasions assumed a high degree of public importance between civilised states.

In the 'Edinburgh Review' he wrote frequently on subjects of modern history and politics, and these contributions were not interrupted by the labours of official life. A series of seven articles especially, on the political memoirs of the last and present centuries which have appeared within the last few years, forms a connected narrative of political changes from the time of the Rockingham Administration to the Reform Bill. We earnestly hope that these papers will appear as a separate work, and thus become more accessible to the general reader. But if the variety of his writings in the periodicals already mentioned is such as to astonish us and defy enumeration, the number of his contributions scattered through the volumes of 'Notes and Queries' is still more surprising. Taking only the second series of this publication, we find articles from him on the following subjects—they are signed sometimes with his name, sometimes with his initials (G. C. L.), and sometimes only L.:—'Niebuhr on the Legend of Tarpeia' (vol. iii.). On this question we believe that he was, through a friend, corresponding with Dr. Pantaleone, of Rome, whilst he was actually engaged in the preparation of his budget as Chancellor of the Exchequer; 'The Tin Trade of Antiquity' (vol. v.); 'The Amber Trade of Antiquity' (vol. vi.); 'Tartessus' (vol. vii.); 'The Vulture in Italy,' 'The Lion in Greece and Italy,' 'Ancient Names of the Cat' (vol. viii.) 'On the Bonasus, the Bison, and the Bubalus' (vol. ix.). In connexion with the subjects of these last papers, we may add that he was extremely anxious to promote the publication of a Dictionary of Greek and Roman Natural History, and had

communicated with his friend Dr. Wm. Smith on the matter. He wished to secure the proper completion of such a book, which does not in fact exist either in English or German, and which would be one of extreme value to the classical student. A very short time before his death he inserted in 'Notes and Queries' a most interesting paper on 'The Presidency of Deliberative Assemblies.' We do not mention the numerous pamphlets which he wrote on various occasions, though some of them were of great merit, and had much weight at the time of their appearance. In these productions of his laborious pen, and also in his Parliamentary Speeches, the style of Sir George Lewis was eminently characteristic of his powerful mind and unpretending character. With a true relish for the correct beauty of the highest order of composition, he disdained all rhetorical display, and held very lightly to those artifices of words which are apt to mislead the judgment though they please the imagination. His own chosen form of expression was full, clear, and strong;—seeking no ornament, and admitting of no variety of illustration beyond that which the matter in hand naturally suggested. A writer who adhered to these principles, and who sought to instruct rather than to please—to convey a thought rather than to shape a sentence—might be dry, and could not hope to be popular. But we doubt not that the contributions of Sir George Lewis to the political, historical, and philosophical literature of Europe, will outlive many of the performances of his more brilliant contemporaries.

Lord Macaulay, in those beautiful lines written after his defeat at Edinburgh, in 1847, represents the Muse or Fairy Queen, who presides over the destinies of literary men, as addressing her infant protégé in the following words:—

'There are, who while to vulgar eyes they seem  
Of all my bounties largely to partake,  
Of me, as of some rival's handmaid, deem,  
And court me for gain's, pow'r's, fashion's sake :

'To such, though deep their lore, though wide their fame,  
Shall my great mysteries be all unknown :  
But thou, through good and evil, praise and blame,  
Wilt thou not love me for myself alone ?'

If there ever was a man who 'loved her for herself alone,' that man was Sir George Lewis: his pursuit of literature was free from the smallest taint of low or sordid motives, but he did not on account of his love of letters abandon the paths of politics, nor did that ruling passion impair his influence in Parliament or the Cabinet. His official position and his share in

public affairs were not lowered or diminished by his literary labours: on the contrary, men of all parties who look forward to the future, now think that they foresee the time when a single man of tried ability, sound judgment, perfect uprightness, and immense resources of knowledge, round whom floating and wavering politicians might safely group themselves, will be sorely missed in the councils of England. It is unfortunately useless to speculate on the fruits which the country might have reaped from that peculiar union of solid learning and honesty with so many brilliant and kindly qualities, which we have with a sorrowful heart attempted imperfectly to sketch.

ART. VI.—1. *Les Marines de la France et de l'Angleterre.*  
Par M. XAVIER RAYMOND. Paris: 1863.

2. *Iron-clad sea-going Shield Ships. A Lecture delivered on the 25th March, 1863, at the Royal United Service Institution, by CAPTAIN COWPER PHIPPS COLES, R.N.* London.

THE prosperity, and perhaps we might add the safety, of this country has been recently threatened by two events widely different in their nature, but to some extent suggesting the same train of thought, and bringing to view the same national characteristics. We have seen our staple manufacture suddenly paralysed, and those wooden walls which we have trusted in for centuries rendered useless. There are many Englishmen, and still more foreigners, who may have thought that our commercial prosperity, to say the least, and with it much of our internal peace and order, depended on so great a branch of our national industry as the cotton manufacture. It was still more a national tradition, and the general belief of foreigners, that to our 'wooden walls' we owed our security at home, and our consideration abroad. And if these two great sources of national strength were separately of importance, few persons would have doubted that the simultaneous loss of both would have been a most serious calamity.

Yet, since 1860 we have seen that industry which brought us so much wealth almost swept away, and our vast and costly array of war-ships superseded. To add to the importance of this latter fact, the superiority at sea which we had possessed with our wooden walls was for a time at least transferred to the rival who had invented walls of iron. The genius of a French naval architect had given to his country a temporary grasp of the trident which we considered our inheritance.

We have all witnessed these things, and their results up to the present time are well known. We have had local distress but no commercial ruin, no bankruptcy, no dissatisfaction or sedition, no extra taxes, no panic in the funds. The cotton crisis is probably at its worst, and has shown that we are one people, and not the 'two nations' of a political novelist. The collapse, to use a popular expression, of our wooden navy has been in its way more complete than that of the cotton manufacture; but even the fact of our inferiority to France in the only ships which can now enter the line of battle has caused no alarm at home, nor speculation upon the possibility of invasion abroad. The extinction of our wooden fleet (for it amounts to that) did not cause a fractional decline of the funds, and our hopes of success with untried weapons are almost as great as if we had already conquered with them.

This contrast between what is and what might have been expected by the most sagacious, is certainly a strange phenomenon. It would be very interesting to examine the causes of so great a discrepancy; but we do not propose to dwell upon the cotton crisis here, further than to observe certain points which it has in common with the naval crisis.

It is a common fallacy to mistake some results of our commercial greatness or of our naval strength for the cause. Thus our cotton manufacture has been assigned as the cause of that prodigious activity which embraces the whole globe. If it had been so, of course our whole commercial system would now be under an eclipse, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have presented us with a very different budget: but the fact is, that the cotton manufacture was only one of the outlets which our productive industry made for itself; and if that outlet be permanently stopped, the same energies which first made it, will make others. It is the same with our naval strength, of which our *late* navy was a developement and very powerful expression, but by no means the cause. The sources of our naval as well as commercial strength lie deep in the genius and character of the people, and are, as we may hope, more indestructible than a particular industry or a particular weapon of war.

That national habit of self-help and popular co-operation which distinguishes England from her continental neighbour proved of great value in the cotton crisis. Private charity, organised and directed by capable persons, sufficed to meet the first difficulties; and while its immediate effect was to alleviate the distress, it also tended to promote concord at home, and to raise our character abroad. We may trace the good effects of this same national characteristic in a very different field of



action, re-establishing our reputation for military spirit, and making the temporary loss of our fleet a very different matter from what it would have been some years ago. Ten years have hardly elapsed since we scarcely had the name of an army at home—no militia and no volunteer force. Our sole defence was a fleet which previous and subsequent experience has shown to be least available when most wanted. Even that fleet, moreover, we have learned, upon official authority in 1859, had no longer any practical superiority over the French fleet. A well-known Treasury minute, dated in December of the previous year, revealed the unpleasant fact, that while we were building ships of an obsolete class, our rivals had constructed an efficient fleet. Other mistakes of the same kind had weakened public confidence in the administration of naval affairs, and, in the absence of a sufficient land force, we had experienced what Mr. Cobden has designated as ‘The Three Panics.’ But happily in England we do not look to Government alone for help. A most singular instance of popular action supplying the supposed deficiencies of a public department followed our last alarm—let us hope our very last—and created a volunteer army in the midst of peace. That army was the truest expression of popular feeling in England, and was rightly appreciated in Europe. It had been alleged that, in becoming manufacturers, we had lost all military spirit as a nation; but the volunteer movement contradicted the theory. Thenceforward the invasion of England ceased to be a favourite topic abroad, for the question was no longer whether our fleet could be overmatched or evaded, but whether a people who had *not* lost all the military virtues would be likely to fall an easy prey even if invaded.

That this revival of military spirit in England made some difference in the feelings with which we heard the doom of our wooden walls in 1861 cannot be doubted. Our outer defences had been effectually breached by M. Dupuy de Lôme when he built a French iron-cased frigate that would have made short work of our finest three-deckers; but the breach served to show a gallant array within; and there certainly was no panic this time, though the facts were alarming and instructive enough. A second time within a few years French genius had made our whole fleet obsolete, and, for the purposes of European warfare, useless: but this time we had a competent inner intrenchment, and could proceed more leisurely to repair the breach.

The task before us was a most serious one: nothing less than to build a new fleet upon entirely new principles, and to surpass if possible the models of a great master in the art of naval construction. We had this time to build from the foundation; and,

in fairness to the Admiralty, it must be remembered that it was not always their part to strike out new systems. To use a shop-keeping illustration very much to the point, we were like a tradesman already provided with a 'large assortment of 'goods,' but *not* of the 'newest patterns.' It was not our business to introduce new fashions which would make our stock on hand unsaleable. Perhaps, indeed, we were slow in moving, and did not always move in the right direction when we did move; but this time, as has been said, the ground was clear before us: let us see how we have acquitted ourselves in a fair race.

From the moment that experience proved the possibility of casing sea-going or cruising ships with iron-plates capable of resisting such artillery as was then known, the doom of our wooden bulwarks was pronounced. It was clearly as necessary to meet iron with iron as it would have been to discard bows and arrows in favour of modern artillery had we not already done so. France had previously had the honour of proving the efficacy of armour-cased floating batteries at Kinburn, in 1855 (our own, built at the French emperor's suggestion, had arrived too late). In 1858 the first real iron-clad ship of war was laid down in the same country, and designed by the same eminent architect who had produced the 'Napoleon,' the first really successful screw line-of-battle ship. The new iron-clad, which even exceeded the hopes entertained of her, was appropriately named 'La Gloire'; and thus to M. Dupuy de Lôme belonged the honour of having twice within ten years devised the means of totally changing the nature and conditions of naval war. The 'Gloire' was launched in 1859, and France then possessed a ship, as she had in 1852, which had no equal afloat. As this first attempt produced an admirable model which it only remained to copy, thirteen more iron-clads were ordered on the same lines, to maintain the start which had been so fairly gained; and although we followed in the wake, the balance of strength was against us in 1861: of course we speak of iron-clads alone. It is to this date we would have the reader turn, bearing in mind that, with the advantage already gained by France, it was a matter of the first necessity for England to make up lee-way, and acquire an equality in actual strength before venturing too much upon purely experimental constructions. Whether we have succeeded in redressing the balance in all respects, as we certainly have in numbers, must be matter of opinion. The correct data for forming such opinion we are able to supply; and leaving the reader to draw his own conclusions as to our iron-clad fleet, we must now present him with those of M. Xavier

Raymond on naval matters in general, and the relative strength of England and France as maritime Powers.

There are probably very few French writers who could have reviewed the history of the French and English navies since 1815 in the same fair and candid spirit as M. Raymond has done. He feels (and warmly too) as a Frenchman, but thinks as an Englishman, or at least argues upon principles more generally accepted among ourselves than among our neighbours. M. Raymond was attached by M. Guizot to the mission of M. de Lagrénée to China, some twenty years ago, and in the course of that and other voyages he acquired a great love of the sea, and a deep interest in naval affairs. He also visited India, and there conceived a strong and lasting regard for England, and a high respect for her national power. When the French press still enjoyed freedom of discussion, M. Raymond was distinguished as a writer in its most powerful organ; and the work now before us was published in part last year, in a series of papers which appeared in our highly valued contemporary, the '*Revue des Deux Mondes*.' We gather from it that, though not a seaman, he has for many years lived much with naval men, and has studied for the last twenty-five years what may be called the Naval Question. So far as a strong interest in his subject, industry, candour, and rare truthfulness, can qualify him, M. Raymond may be considered to have the necessary qualities for the task he has set himself. When it was in his power to ascertain the facts upon which he reasons, he did so conscientiously; and when he failed to satisfy himself, he tells us so honestly. On the one hand, his pride in the French navy, and his regard for the French sailor, make him a good champion of maritime France; on the other hand, his sympathy with liberty, with representative government, free trade, and commercial pursuits, make him just towards England. While handling a delicate subject—especially delicate for Frenchmen—he is never betrayed into a sneer or illiberal censure. Whatever would be praiseworthy in France, M. Raymond finds praiseworthy in England; and he can praise without such a qualifying addition as often amounts to covert censure. We would especially recommend to notice the just and reasonable view of England's maritime preponderance taken by M. Raymond. He accepts that preponderance as an existing fact, which it is England's interest and duty to herself to perpetuate, but he denies that such preponderance is any part of European law or obligatory on other Powers; in other words, M. Raymond thinks it a fact to be quietly maintained in deeds but not in words. The distinction is a real and

practical one, which meets us in everyday life. We cheerfully concede the precedence which social usages have given to our more fortunate neighbour, but we don't expect him to parade that precedence in an offensive manner, nor to demand our formal recognition of it. Those who value a good understanding with France may learn something from M. Raymond's remarks upon our Parliamentary discussions on this question. He contends that France is blamed there for the inevitable results of her more efficient naval administration, and that this is the more unreasonable on our part, inasmuch as France obtains these results at a less cost than our own naval expenditure. It is as a partisan of the English alliance that M. Raymond dwells upon the danger to which it is exposed by what he considers the short-sightedness and inefficiency of our Admiralty system. Defending himself against those amongst his own countrymen who might say that if we are satisfied with a barren and unproductive system, it is our own business, he adds: —

'The constant failures of the English Admiralty may often cause regrets, because in England they tend indirectly to promote that distrust of us which mars a good understanding, while in France they are the sources of dangerous mistakes. It is not in human nature to admit a fault willingly; the Admiralty, therefore, when it meets with some fresh mishap, when it finds itself palpably distanced by some invention which we have carried into practice, adopts a method of excusing itself which, although answering the purpose, is not calculated to promote mutual good-will . . . Instead of honestly confessing its mistakes, it exclaims against French ambition, accuses us of plotting, and of plans of invasion which nothing bears out; it stirs up the public feeling against us, and at the same time obtains some hundred million of francs (from Parliament) to repair past errors . . . Would it not be better for ourselves that the Admiralty should never be placed in a position so false as well as dangerous?' (Pp. 414-5.)

'On the other hand, when we see the English Admiralty struggling with one of those mischances with which it periodically embarrasses itself, we see a host of people in France also (honest people enough, but rather ill-informed), whose notion of the highest patriotism consists in slandering a neighbour and possible adversary: we see them hasten to draw from circumstances which they cannot appreciate, conclusions that are quite erroneous. Judging other countries by what they see at home, they take the Admiralty for the true representative of England's naval power; they believe her to be decrepit and weak, and indulge in the most extravagant fancies. The truth is, however, that England is still the greatest naval Power in the world, that it is absurd to measure that power by the acts and deeds of the Admiralty, seeing that the Admiralty, as it now stands, is but a detail, a fraction of the budget, a first stake in the game; it is but the staff or the advance of a force, that in case of a serious struggle would draw in-

exhaustible resources—if anything be inexhaustible in this world—from the nation itself. In France the naval administration represents by far the largest share of that strength which entitles us to be called a naval Power.' (P. 416.)

The objects aimed at by M. Raymond, as we gather from his preface, are to refute the claims of England to limit the naval forces of other Powers; to trace the causes of the ill-will which he thinks that we entertain towards the French navy; to support the influence and prestige of France by showing the steady progress of her navy since 1815; to warn his countrymen against the danger of underrating their rivals; and, lastly, to point out a great error in the naval system of France. Though that part which relates to the assumed claims of England is addressed especially to this country, and occupies a large portion of the book, we need not follow M. Raymond through his argument. We readily concede that England can have no right to dictate to France what naval force she shall create or maintain. But, in fact, no one does assume such a right. The only reason why there may apparently be such a pretension on our part is, that the discussion of a delicate topic is transferred from the cabinet and the sphere of diplomacy, to the outspoken debates of Parliament. Here and there (but very rarely) an independent member may have expressed himself rashly upon this subject, and so may also some writers in the press. It is clearly not a topic which can be judiciously or usefully treated in such discussions, and they are a bad result of the distrust which our naval administration has inspired. Still it does not follow that two friendly Governments may not come to an amicable understanding as to the relative strength of their navies. Some approach has already been made in principle by the appointment of naval attachés to the respective embassies of England and France. As these officers, by keeping their Governments well informed of the naval movements on each side of the Channel, will leave no room for such suspicions or surprises, as we have experienced of late years. If we further admit that, in her past exertions to improve her navy, France has given us no just cause of complaint, there will remain little ground of difference with M. Raymond upon the question of armaments.

Before entering upon the great question of iron-clads (we owe our American cousins thanks for the word), it may be well to follow M. Raymond in his retrospect of naval affairs since 1815: the review is not so gratifying to our national pride as it is to that of our neighbours, but it may be profitable. From 1815 M. Raymond dates that revival of French

naval genius which has produced such striking results—inulnerable ships being only the latest product of it. Nor can we conceal from ourselves that it is France who has taken the lead in these improvements, which have completely changed the nature of naval war. We are accustomed to admit the superiority of French genius in certain arts, but in maritime affairs we should not have been prepared to accept France as our teacher, our ‘institutrice,’ as M. Raymond calls it. Let us hear him on this point:—

‘In 1815, after so many glorious victories, England seemed to be justified in regarding herself as the instructress of all other Powers in naval matters. Now, since 1815 she has in that respect received everything from others, and given them almost nothing in return. The improvements in sailing ships, in the first place, improvements which she has been forced to copy, and which include every part of a ship of war, are all of French origin . . . At a later time, when the application of the screw allowed of building real steam ships of war, it was from France again that the model came which England had to copy—the “Napoleon.” And still later, when the experiment made at Kinburn by France upon her own idea proved the value of iron armour as means of defence, it was France again which produced the first type of fighting ship and cruiser which ever appeared upon the waters cased in iron; and that model still maintains its superiority both as a sea-boat and as a weapon of war over all the copies that have been designed. The English begin by depreciating and questioning her good qualities, but the lesson given by the “Merrimac” having come, the “Times” exclaims suddenly, “We must not deceive ourselves, our whole navy is reduced to two ships, the “Warrior” and “Black Prince!” Then the same paper, and very soon many others both in America and England, adopt the phrase of M. Dupuy de Lôme, in the Council of State; when asking for the funds to build the “Gloire,” he exclaimed, “One ship of the kind pushed into the middle of a whole fleet of your old wooden ships would there with her 36 guns be like a lion among a flock of sheep.”

‘If the art of defence produced such results, the means of attack and destruction make equal progress on their side. Rifled cannon appear; France, which had already furnished the Paixhans’s gun against wooden walls, is the first to employ the rifled gun as an ordinary weapon.’ (Pp. 22–4.)

The merit of originality no one will deny to the masterpiece of M. Dupuy de Lôme, but we may have something to say as to the continued superiority of that undoubtedly great effort of genius.

Nor was it only by inventive enterprise that France signalised the reviving spirit of her navy. M. Raymond recounts a long list of very considerable warlike achievements, either wholly due to the French navy or shared by it.

'In 1823, the year which may be considered the date of its regeneration, the French navy blockaded Cadiz and the Guadalquivir, and reduced the fortress of Santi Petri. In 1828, it carried an army to the Morea, and commenced that long and trying blockade which was to terminate, in 1831, by the capture of Algiers. In 1831, it took possession of Ancona, and forced the entrance of the Tagus. In the following years it had many engagements on the coast of Africa. In 1834, it went to Carthage and St. Domingo. In 1839, it reduced the fort of St. Jean d'Ulloa, after a brilliant action. In 1841, it took possession of the Comoro Islands, the Marquesas, and Tahiti. In 1844, it destroyed the batteries of Tangiers and Mogador. In 1849, it transported the army to Civita Vecchia. In 1859, it supported at Genoa and Venice the operations of the army of Italy, and at the same time commenced in Cochin China the operations which were to afford Admiral Charner further opportunities of victories. All these enterprises succeeded: in none of them did we sustain a single reverse.'

Besides these operations of a force solely French, M. Raymond (p. 82.) recounts those in combination with England, 'always yielding to France an equal share of honour except 'when her flag obtained special distinction.'

This recapitulation of naval achievements is worthy of attention, as showing how much French writers identify the last startling productions of their naval power with its general and steady advance in efficiency. A brief sketch of the English navy during the same period (which we need not quote here) contrasts unfavourably with that which has been given of the French, yet the comparison is not drawn in an offensive spirit. M. Raymond traces the greater relative progress of his countrymen to the better constitution of their naval administration; and if he be right in his view, the same cause may continue to produce the same effects. But in most respects the naval history of the past may indeed be compared to 'an old 'almanack.' We have entered upon a new career in naval construction, an unlimited field for ingenuity is before us, and the prize of success awaits the most 'judicious innovator.' As a consequence of the change in the material of naval war, there must be an equally great change in the mode of fighting and the training of the combatants—in short, there must be a new 'personnel' for a new 'materiel.'

It might be interesting though useless to speculate on the effects of such a change upon our maritime supremacy. The British sailor, our ancient boast, and the article of which we had most (and could get least when wanted), will have lost much of his value, and so far the change may seem unfavourable to us. But M. Raymond, who has studied the question with

much acuteness, thinks that England has nothing to fear from the naval revolution. In a very practical chapter on the conditions of naval power, he argues that, under the new as under the old order of things, we have all the elements of strength—wealth, mechanical skill, vast manufacturing and ship-building establishments, great commercial enterprise, a numerous and hardy seafaring population, and, above all, the unity and patriotism that liberty produces.

In M. Raymond's chapter upon the conditions of naval power, though there may be nothing new to those who have thought much upon the subject, there is a breadth and justness of view, which will strike the English reader forcibly. Had Mr. Cobden written upon the same subject, he would have treated it probably in the same manner, though not exactly in the same spirit. Having told us (p. 369.) that the three elements of naval power are:—

'Wealth, flourishing manufactures, and a population of sailors, which is itself, again, a result proportioned to the merchant navy of each people,' M. Raymond adds, 'Money, it has been said, is the sinews of war, and we need not go far to prove that this is as true of a naval force as of any other. There are, however, some data of the proposition which it may be well to lay before the reader, to convince him that at sea still less than elsewhere, could the place of money be supplied by individual energy or popular enthusiasm; nor would such revolutionary proceedings as some people believe in, be of more avail. The serious expenses of the improved engines of a modern navy, the cost of what we now consider its commonest operations, will serve to show the distance at which the very nature of things has placed the different flags, and the chance which any one Power has of changing that order of procedure in its own favour. Thus, at the commencement of this century, in Nelson's days, the English, by dividing the total expense of a fleet by the number of its guns, calculated that each gun, which may be considered to represent the military strength of ships, cost 1,000*l.* For steam line-of-battle ships the estimate varied from 5,000*l.* to 6,000*l.*; it is now above 10,000*l.* per broadside gun in the iron-cased frigate "Warrior," which ship, according to the statement made by Lord Clarence Paget, secretary to the Admiralty, in the House of Commons, cost 367,000*l.*\* In many countries the total expenditure upon the navy is less than the sum required for a single one of these ships. Add to this, that the least estimate for redemption of capital, maintenance, repairs, &c., is 20 per cent. on the cost; consider, again, that the "Warrior" cannot steam even in fine weather at a less expense than 27*s.* to 30*s.* for each league

---

\* The 'Gloire' cost only 188,000*l.*; but it is right to add that she carries 36 guns instead of 40, and the engines are of 900 horse power instead of 1,250.



run. Now these armour-plated ships, having entered into our line of battle, how many second-rate navies which once played an honourable, even glorious, part now find themselves distanced by the mere question of finance? Treating the question from the other side, we arrive at a similar but more unfavourable result for the secondary Powers. At the commencement of this century England had to fit out a great fleet to reduce Copenhagen. How many armour-plated frigates would be required now-a-days to produce fully as much effect as the great fleet of Nelson and Sir Hyde Parker? Would not two be enough, and three perhaps too many? And let it not be thought that, by devoting all the money spent upon her navy to building iron-cased frigates, Denmark could at least retain her ancient position; it would not be so: the fortifications which contributed to her defence in 1801 have lost nearly all their value against iron-cased ships.' (Pp. 370-3.)

M. Raymond observes, that while without a large budget there cannot be a naval Power, yet, though money be an essential point, it is not the only one: 'there cannot be a naval Power without extensive trade.' Formerly, he observes, the strength of a naval Power consisted in the supplies which had been accumulated in the naval arsenals, and this partly because the insufficient means of transport rendered such previous accumulations necessary. Of this difficulty M. Raymond gives some striking instances, but railways have altered matters. It would be cheaper and easier, now that there is a continuous line of railway from St. Petersburg to Toulon, Rochefort and Cherbourg, to draw timber for masts from Russia, than it was under the empire to draw them from the Vosges or from Switzerland; but, further, it was only in the naval arsenals formerly that any of the larger articles used in the navy could be made.

'Now, the largest anchors, the most powerful engines, and iron armour plates are made in the private establishments of France, and still more in those of England. These foundries which make the large cylinders, the ponderous shafts for engines of 1,000 horse-power, would make light work of cannon of the largest calibres, of anchors,' &c.

The increased consumption of iron, M. Raymond truly says, adds another tie between the navy and the manufacturer, of which Russia had a proof when her army, in spite of numbers and valour, was overwhelmed by the immense material which the workshops of England and France vomited forth from so far and so fast against her. It must, M. Raymond says, have embittered the last moments of the emperor Nicholas, who disliked the commercial classes for their liberalism, and was fond of calling them those 'perruquiers,' to know how large a share they had in his humiliation.

M. Raymond expects that the chief characteristic of every future contest will be the inexhaustible supply of all the material of war which private industry will furnish to the belligerents, and the strength and suddenness of the blows which with such aid may be struck. The supplies sent to the Allies in the Crimean war, contrasted with the supplies so painfully drawn by Russia, give some notion of this, and the campaign of Italy in 1859 no less so. In all the military operations of the Second Empire, the French navy has taken a distinguished part: and in none more than in the present campaign in Mexico, in which 50,000 men have been thrown across the Atlantic and supported in a hostile country by French ships of war. Steam, he considers upon these grounds, has added to the naval strength of England; and although her line-of-battle ships, which lately outnumbered the combined navies of the world, have been superseded by iron-clads, of which France, having got the start, now possesses an equal number, 'who can doubt that the same causes which had produced so great a disproportion in the number of line-of-battle ships, will operate with equal strength in very shortly bringing about the same results in armour-cased ships?' (P. 389.)

As to steam-power, then, M. Raymond differs altogether from those who say 'it will re-establish an equality at sea; and though as to armour-cased ships, which, having, so to speak, no masts, will present themselves in battle as bare as pontoons, it is undeniable that we do not require as much as our predecessors did those picked men, those topmen, who were the type of the sailor in former days,' still, M. Raymond thinks a special class of seamen will not the less be required, and that the improved engines both of locomotion and destruction, the rapidity and power of evolution in modern ships, demand no less skill, experience, discipline, and courage than was needed of old. It may be observed here that the great extension of French commerce is assumed to have given France the second place among maritime Powers.

Two incidental remarks of M. Raymond, while treating upon this subject, will strike the naval reader. In reference to the enormous range of modern artillery, he speaks of 1,200 metres (1,312 yards) as the 'normal regulation distance' for engaging in former times. If there had been any regulation upon the subject in our navy, a nearer approach than three quarters of a mile would certainly have been commanded. Upon the power of evolution possessed by steam fleets, it is said by M. Raymond that even Admiral Hugon, who 'had a special reputation for his daring and able evolutions, when he directed the

‘movements of the Mediterranean squadron, would never, notwithstanding all his energy and ability, have dreamed of doing a number of things which are considered mere amusements in the present day. But these things can only be done because our officers apply themselves to the duties of their profession with no less vigilance and activity, with no less skill and experience, than their predecessors. Whatever may be done, the efficiency of ships will always be in proportion to the talents and other qualities of the seamen on board of them.’ (P. 395.)

The ‘daring manœuvres’ of Admiral Hugon here referred to, included the difficult and trying practice of manœuvring in the closest order, a thing never attempted in our squadrons. It seems from the above extract, and still more from another passage, at p. 394., that the French fleet of the present day greatly excels that of their celebrated ‘Squadron of Evolutions’ in the power of executing rapid manœuvres in the closest order, ‘shoulder to shoulder, like infantry.’ Our officers will do well to note these facts, for although the more homogeneous nature of a French fleet giving more uniform speed to the ships must facilitate their movements, something also must be attributed to assiduous practice, and probably to the French naval administration having devised a system of naval tactics adapted to steam.

It would be unjust to M. Raymond, whose strictures upon our navy we have quoted, and shall have to quote, were we not to show that he can praise in as honest a spirit as he can blame, and no doubt with more satisfaction. It may be observed, too, that while the objects of his praises are essential features in our national life, his blame is principally bestowed upon a department in no very high favour among ourselves—our naval administration. M. Raymond must not imagine that the English, generally speaking, are ‘touchy’ on that point, for most of us could listen with considerable equanimity to any strictures upon our Admiralty system. There is nothing offensive in M. Raymond’s censures on this subject, for they clearly emanate from goodwill rather than enmity to this country, and have nothing personal in them. It was necessary to the view he had taken of the English and French navies to explain why our apparent inferiority on several points, and various occasions since 1815, does not really imply the decrepitude which some French writers suppose. It is not every Frenchman that would search out the hidden causes of a rival’s inferiority when a more obvious and agreeable solution offered itself; but M. Raymond is a sincere lover of English liberty, and a believer in those principles of which he had seen the good results among us. Hence

he is unwilling to admit that the defects of a single department should be alleged in proof of degeneracy in that country where, if anywhere, we must look for the advantages of self-government. As a Frenchman also deeply interested in the maritime developement of France, he sees danger in underrating the naval strength of England. In his opinion the facts to be accounted for can be satisfactorily explained by supposing a badly-organised administration of our navy. He had seen British fleets inferior to French fleets in the ships comprising them, in their internal organisation, in their efficient performance of certain duties (see pp. 81-2., 94-9.,\* 103-14., &c.), and even in their discipline (p. 413.), for French eyes were not shut to the discreditable mutinies of late years. He had seen us since then building ships of a class wisely discarded by France, and twice in three years giving her a dangerous advantage. In short, he had seen brilliant success follow the efforts of his own country to revive their navy, while the results of much larger naval estimates in England were, to say the least, very unsatisfactory. With a laudable industry, and not less praiseworthy freedom from prejudice, the author of 'Les Marines de la France et de l'Angleterre' traces these facts to their cause; and if we reject his theory, we must adopt one far more mortifying to our national pride. It is to be remarked, too, that the same chapter which most strongly condemns our Admiralty system, contains also the most flattering proofs of sincere regard for those qualities which constitute our national greatness. Nor does that writer confound the system itself with those who administer it — if he did so, he would find few Englishmen who concurred with him in decrying the merits of the nobleman who now presides over the Admiralty, and the many distinguished officers who have had seats at that Board.

We may, in proof of this view, quote M. Raymond's concluding remarks upon the constitution of the Admiralty, notwithstanding the merits of those who compose it: —

\* We cannot accept the accuracy of M. Raymond's assertion as to 'certain violence' used by the French Admiral to drag his English colleague before Cronstadt without some proof; the anecdote must be of French origin, and both the officers concerned have now passed away from among us. But although the appointment of Sir Charles Napier, when time and gout were well known to have impaired his nerve, was injudicious, the French Admiral was not their best officer. At least, such was the opinion of the distinguished French General employed in the Baltic, who, in reply to the Emperor's question about the allied Admirals, is reported to have answered: 'Sire, they were two old women, but *ours* was at least a *lady*.'

‘It is an inert indolent body gifted with inordinate powers of consumption, and with productive faculties proportionately small; it is condemned by its very constitution to improvidence and surprises, and, in short, possesses very little capacity for keeping its affairs in order. One remarkable fact among the many may be cited that would justify this opinion; namely, that with estimates frequently double the amount of ours, the English navy, administered as it is by the Admiralty, has not for the last fifty years given in material produce (ships) much greater results than we have derived from our Ministry of Marine.’ (P. 411.)

Elsewhere, M. Raymond, looking at the constitution of a Board of Admiralty, calls it ‘the least rational constitution of ‘an administrative body which exists in any country’ (p. 399.); and tells us, at p. 403., that it is ‘one of the most singular institutions in the world, and the most fatally condemned to consume immense resources in producing comparatively trifling ‘results.’

So far then as the results actually obtained or theoretically to be expected from a governing body wanting in unity and responsibility, M. Raymond, as we have seen, thinks very unfavourably of them. But the Admiralty is not England, he tells us: we need only turn to the activity, intelligence, and progress of our commercial marine in private builders to see where England’s strength lies. Of this he gives us instances, when —

‘The English, feeling dissatisfied with the part they had played in the Crimea, proposed to take their revenge in the Baltic. They wished to destroy Cronstadt, which they had had leisure to study during the two preceding campaigns. Whether their plan was good or bad we need not discuss here, but they conceived the idea of crushing or burning it under a shower of projectiles thrown from small craft, gunboats, and mortar vessels, to be built for that special service. For the construction of these small vessels recourse was had to private builders, and, amongst others, to the celebrated builder Mr. Laird, M.P. for Birkenhead, where his building yard is situated on the Mersey, opposite Liverpool. It was the 25th of October when the plan of the first gunboat reached him, and when consequently he could only begin his work. On the 11th of the next November, the gunboat, fully fitted except her engine, entered Portsmouth under sail. We don’t know the tonnage of this vessel, but for the reader’s information we may mention that these gunboats were of several classes, from 212 to 868 tons each: she must, therefore, have been above 200 tons. After giving this proof of activity, Mr. Laird signed a contract with the Government authorising him to build on plans supplied to him, and at prices agreed on, as many gunboats as possible until the day when notice should be given of terminating the contract. The Government on its part engaged to take until the contract was fulfilled

whatever there should be in the yard. On this understanding Mr. Laird organised his works, where they laboured day and night with such effect that, when he received the order to stop work, he was delivering one vessel daily, to Government.' (P. 419.)

Extraordinary as was this feat of private enterprise, we are told that Messrs. Penn, of Greenwich, equalled it in the construction of the engines, turning out eighty between December and April, and thus enabling us to make the great Spithead demonstration in that month.

At this demonstration M. Raymond was present, and says:—

'We saw there 50 bomb vessels, all ready for service, 140 steam gunboats, completely armed, rigged, and stored, sailing, manœuvring and firing before 100,000 spectators. This was the creation of the last winter; it was the vanguard of the fleet which already possessed imposing reserves, and which could easily have been doubled within the year. It was also a great lesson to the world, which Lord Palmerston summed up in a significant sentence, when, on the following 8th of May, he said in the House of Commons, "We began the war (Feb. "1854) with 212 ships in commission, we had at its close (in March "1856) 590."' (Pp. 419-21.)

Of our resources in seamen, M. Raymond says—

'The power of England displays itself in figures no less eloquent than those which we have cited: she does not possess statistics as well arranged or accurate as are ours, but everyone agrees that, exclusive of 80,000 men which she maintains under the flag of her royal navy, the merchant service of England employs 230,000 men at least, in what we call long sea voyages and the coasting trade; and if she applied to all her population who live by the sea the laws of our "Inscription Maritime," she might include in it, counting the small coasting trade, fishermen, boatmen, workmen in the public and private dockyards, 700,000 or even 800,000 men. This would be saying everything; and yet, to be just, we must add that the quality corresponds to the quantity. Let not the blunders of the Admiralty lead us to think that maritime genius has abandoned the English. They follow maritime pursuits with an energy and with talent which may well compare with those of former times, and which have even, perhaps, developed themselves in our days with a grandeur never before witnessed.' (*Ibid.*)

Of the number, size, and excellence of our merchant shipping—of the enterprise of our merchants, and the public spirit which encourages all great experiments in ship-building—M. Raymond speaks almost with enthusiasm, adding:—

'The sea is especially the national business of Englishmen; it is the focus towards which all the ardour of a patriotism vivified by the pure and wholesome spirit of liberty converges: this is not the least cause of her power. The superiority which England possesses

financially, her means of material production, and the number of her maritime population, are also but small matters in our eyes, compared with the moral force imparted to her as the most free and united nation in the world.'

From this view of our national unity even our aristocracy is not allowed to detract. But we have only room for one more extract, which deserves attention, as showing the writer can honestly applaud a patriotic feeling in England, even when originating in suspicions of France. After alluding to the co-operation of all classes in the cotton distress—

'And at the same time with these occurrences in Manchester and Lancashire, what has been called the Volunteer Movement follows its steady developement. The motives which determined this national arming do not appear to us well founded—in our eyes the alarm was imaginary; it is not the less true that we should be impressed with the sincerity and ardour of that patriotism which arms itself even to resist chimeras.'

He adds that there are very few countries where an army of 170,000 men so formed would be safe or would be trusted.

The French writer who can express himself thus upon such topics may well be allowed to criticise some of our institutions. If we think his strictures of our Admiralty system rather too harsh, we must remember that that department enjoys little credit abroad, and has not been in good repute at home; that the faults of its constitution, in theory at least, are undeniable, and have not been redeemed by good results in practice. But if M. Raymond condemns our naval administration, and this it has obtained less favourable results than the French Ministry of Marine, he is no bigoted admirer of the latter. He strongly condemns a French institution which certainly gives much present strength to their navy, though possibly at the expense of its future welfare. The Inscription Maritime is declared to be a grievous hardship and injustice to the French maritime population; and as it compels the *whole* of that class of the nation to serve for a portion of their lives on board the ships of the State, it evidently imposes on them a burden far exceeding that of the military conscription, and therefore tends to drive them to seek other modes of gaining a livelihood.

It is time, however, to turn to the important and interesting subject of those iron-clads, which have taken the place of our wooden walls. Upon the relative value of this new force our future place in the scale of nations must greatly depend; and very lately we were behind our French rivals in the race. The writer whom we have quoted seems to think that, judging from

past administrative failures, our new ships themselves must partake of the same character as our systems. But here, possibly, the French strictly logical turn of mind may carry him too far. We may admit, indeed, that, as M. Raymond asserts, we produced (in the 'Warrior') a horse too big for our stables (p. 147.), and that want of adequate dock accommodation is one of our official oversights; but the building of a ship once decided upon, her construction passes out of the hands of the Admiralty proper into the Controller's department; and it is only justice to the present First Lord to say that in Admiral Robinson he has made a most judicious and happy selection. It is true that the Controller is not a naval architect of world-wide reputation, like M. Dupuy de Lôme; but it is also true that no Englishman is more capable of appreciating M. de Lôme's genius, or admiring its wonderful results. That we have no such great feat of naval architecture in England may be the result of administrative error, for we deliberately abolished, in 1832, the only school of the science we possessed. Our unscientific ship-building during many years cost us vast sums of money and many ludicrous failures. The reason assigned by Sir James Graham for abolishing the School of Naval Architecture was that it had not produced satisfactory results—a good reason, perhaps, for improving it. Our experience of the opposite system has not been more favourable, and we sincerely hope that the Duke of Somerset will restore the institution.

But while giving the honour justly due to M. de Lôme, who struck out a new line and led the way, we are able to show that we have neither been idle nor unsuccessful in the reconstruction of the navy. It was no light or unimportant task, for while its most successful execution involved the expenditure of many millions, failure would have been alike discreditable, wasteful, and dangerous. An impartial review of what has been done in both countries will show that, if the initiative was taken by France, we have neither servilely imitated her, nor yet run too rashly into untried experiments.

In 1861 we were far behind in the race: where are we now? Our iron-plated fleet is confessedly experimental, but it contains the germs of each system which has been proposed upon any competent authority. We have broadside-armed ships properly so called, others concentrating their broadside guns within a portion of their space amidships. We have 'shield' or cupola ships, with one or more turrets or cupolas; and, lastly, we have lighter, partially armed ships for distant foreign service. Any or none of these may prove the best type, but we are ready for making the experiment.



As it is necessary to choose some period as a point of departure in our comparison, let us see how matters stood in February 1861. We had then building, or contracted for, in private yards six iron vessels to be partially plated. These were the 'Warrior' and 'Black Prince,' contracted for in May and October 1859; the 'Defence' and 'Resistance,' contracted for in December 1859; and the 'Hector' and 'Valiant,' in January 1861. The 'Warrior' had been recently launched, and was completing her fittings afloat, and she was the most advanced ship of the six. The 'Black Prince' was launched in February 1861, but in a very incomplete state. There was evidently no hope that more than one of these six could be got to sea within the year; and it was probable that it would be late in the following year before the 'Black Prince,' 'Resistance,' and 'Defence' would be ready for sea, and that the year would elapse before the 'Hector' and 'Valiant' would be available for service afloat. Let us now say a few words as to the progress of ship-building in France at the same date.

France had preparing or prepared sixteen ships, which, for the sake of distinction, may be called ships of the line, inasmuch as, though very different from our old line-of-battle ships, they are yet the ships which would now form the line of battle, and by which a fleet action or general naval engagement must be fought. This fleet is to be composed as follows:—Twelve ships of wood, armour-plated throughout; that is, carrying 30 guns on a single deck, protected from end to end by armour-plates; of immense scantling, large stowage, and a speed which, judging from those that have been tried, is not less than  $12\frac{1}{2}$  knots when at their deepest immersion. These are the—

Gloire,	Province,	Guyenne,
Normandie,	Revanche,	Valeureuse,
Invisible,	Gauloise,	Surveillante,
Savoie,	Magnanime,	Flandres.

Two, the 'Couronne' and 'Heroine,' are similarly armed and similarly protected as to their batteries; the combination, however, of the iron hull with the armour-plating, and its backing, differed considerably from what we have adopted in England, and is probably no improvement upon it. Of these vessels, however, only four are as yet at sea, and the greater number are far from completion.

Two other ships, the 'Magenta' and 'Solferino,' are, as is well known, on quite a different system. These two iron-clads are real two-deckers, armour-cased for a certain portion of their length,

but leaving the extremities above the lower deck battery entirely unprotected. They carry in their two batteries 50 guns, protected, and have realised a speed of upwards of 13 knots under favourable circumstances.

Thus the line-of-battle force of France, prepared or preparing, was of a very homogeneous character; the ships composing it being, except the two last-named, nearly of the same dimensions, horse power and armament, capable of bringing into action, when completed, 520 guns protected by armour plating. From this recapitulation everything but the line-of-battle force has been excluded. The floating batteries which either Power possessed form another part of the history of our iron-clads.

Thus, in March 1861, we stood in relative numbers, prepared and preparing, six to sixteen. The odds were large; nor could we hope that the individual superiority of the English ships might have redressed the balance. Let us fairly and impartially examine where that superiority existed, and compare the ships of the two rival Powers, first singly, and then collectively as a fleet.

The 'Warrior' was our first creation. The 'Gloire' has the honour of being the first iron-clad sea-going ship, not only of France, but of the world. What advantage has one over the other?

The 'Warrior' is built of iron, is as a whole very much stronger and more rigid, to a certain extent less inflammable, has greater speed (when at her best, with a clean bottom) by more than a knot and a half per hour, carries her battery three feet six inches higher out of the water than her rival, will be much more durable as a whole, has much more fighting space between her guns, and her sides, where protected by armour-plating, will probably resist shot better than the 'Gloire,' supposing that the armour plates of each ship are of equal quality. The 'Gloire,' on the other hand, built of wood, carries 30 guns protected by armour-plates, against her rival's 26; her armour-plates surround every portion of her structure, and defend her steering gear and her rudder. Both extremities of the 'Warrior' are exposed above and below the water, and she trusts to watertight decks and compartments for safety, should these undefended extremities be shattered by shot.

The 'Gloire' has facilities for manœuvring not possessed by the 'Warrior;' she can turn completely round the circle in something over six, the 'Warrior' in something over eight, minutes. The 'Gloire' is so lightly rigged that her masts, &c., can be no danger to her in action; the 'Warrior' has the

spars and sails of an old 90-gun ship. The 'Gloire' is about 255 feet long at the water line; the 'Warrior' 380. The 'Warrior' can cruise under sail, and keep a position off a given point better than the 'Gloire.' We may hope that both can keep off the rocks; but if such a misfortune as grounding on a rocky bed befel either of them, the damage to the thin plates of the 'Warrior's' bottom would imperil the ship, in spite of water-tight bulkheads and compartments, more seriously than any ordinary thumping and grinding would affect the mass of solid timber forming the bottom of the 'Gloire.'

Setting, therefore, impartially the advantages of one ship against that of the other, supposing the artillery and the crews to be of equal quality, on whose side would be the superiority on the day of battle? Sanguine Englishmen, looking to the 'Warrior's' admitted advantages—speed, height of ports, more roomy decks, more invulnerable sides (where defended), and the less inflammable nature of the materials of which she is composed—will back her as the winner; they will make light of the superiority in number of protected guns, of the wholly protected ship, of the defended rudder, of the facility for turning, of the immunity from falling spars, and greater safety therefore of the screw from fouling, possessed by the 'Gloire.' There are not wanting others whose convictions would be entirely the other way. Perhaps, however, it is but wise to admit that such a duel as has been supposed offers certain chances to each antagonist, and that the result could not be foreseen. And if we adopt this view as a safe middle course between opposite opinions, 'what,' it may be asked, 'has England got in return for the nearly double expense of the "Warrior," as superiority in combat is, after all, the true test of "value?" We should reply that, assuming equal chances of victory, there will still remain to the 'Warrior's' credit greater durability, and the power of adapting such heavier ordnance as the progress of artillery may require. A smaller ship would not have this power. But still we suspect that the 'Warrior' would not have emanated from the office of the present Controller of the Navy.

If, however, the 'Warrior' and 'Black Prince' could engage the 'Gloire' and her consorts on equal terms—in the opinion of some persons with manifest advantage—ship to ship—the same could not be said of the 'Resistance' and 'Defence': 14 guns under the protection of armour-plates could not be a match for 30. The superior speed in this case would be on the side of the French; the difference in the height of battery would still be in favour of the English ships, but

every other disadvantage mentioned in the 'Warrior's' case would be found in these ships also.

In the spring of 1861, both nations looked forward to having by the close of 1862 two more iron-clads at sea—the 'Hector' and 'Valiant' on our side, the 'Magenta' and 'Solferino' in France. Had our hopes been realised, we should have had a reinforcement to our iron-clad fleet of 64 guns wholly protected, to match the 'Magenta' and 'Solferino's' 100. Our ships exposed at their extremities at and below the water line, theirs defended by armour at and below the water line, but exposed to destruction by shells and other projectiles above the lower deck battery. Our two ships of iron, theirs of wood; greater speed on their side, but more danger of destruction from fire than on ours. Singly the 'Magenta' and 'Solferino' were at least equal to the 'Warrior,' 'Black Prince,' 'Hector' or 'Valiant,' and unquestionably superior to the 'Defence' or the 'Resistance;' collectively the six ships of France would have been more than a match for the six ships of England, for the total number of protected guns on their side would have been 220, on ours 144.

In thus recapitulating what were the prospects of our iron-clad fleet at the commencement of 1861, it is but right to mention that in the autumn of 1860 it had been intended to construct a similar ship to the 'Warrior' (the 'Achilles'), at Chatham, in the dockyard; designs were prepared for this purpose, but owing to circumstances not necessary to refer to in this paper that intention was in abeyance; in fact, not even 'the one horizontal and three vertical bars of iron doing duty for H.M.S. "Achilles,"' with which the daily press amused the public, were then in existence.

This being our state in the spring of 1861, and our prospects for the next two years being such as we have described, it was evident that a most serious effort was necessary to place us simply on an equality with the most powerful nation in Europe. It was patent to everybody that we were not equal to France in that arm by which a battle at sea was to be decided; and it was resolved by all that that inequality should disappear as rapidly as circumstances would permit.

Great efforts were made to hasten the completion of the iron ships then in hand; but it soon became evident that, far from getting the ships under construction by private firms sooner than had been anticipated, the time for their delivery would be greatly exceeded. The contractors pointed out that the nature and quality of the work were of such a superior standard of excellence that they could hardly get it done, and

that the cost of this superior work was ruining them. They one and all declared that iron of the required quality was not to be had. Few manufacturers of iron-plates could be found who could make armour-plates capable of standing the test of shot; and though trusting in the enterprising spirit of private firms overcoming many of these difficulties, the Government clearly foresaw that long delays and many disappointments must attend such novel and difficult constructions, and that the painful consciousness of being manifestly inferior to our powerful rival at sea must be removed by some other and additional means.

Eight line-of-battle-ships of the largest class and newest design were then in the course of construction in the different public yards, some more, some less advanced. The timber for these ships was provided, and tolerably well seasoned; their construction had been commenced in 1858 and 1859, and had been proceeded with as opportunities offered until this time. The further progress of these ships, as originally designed, was at once stopped; and it was resolved to adapt them for armour-plated single-decked ships of the 'Gloire's' class as rapidly as possible. This measure was adopted to cause as little expense as possible, and, above all, to lose no time in procuring a powerful addition to the armour-clad navy of England. It never was supposed that the ships designed for one purpose could be as efficient for another, and totally different, purpose as if originally designed for it. But here we had the means under our own hands of employing a mass of material useless in its then shape, to construct a most powerful warlike weapon, not so good, perhaps, as one forged and made for the express purpose, but still of great value, at little expense, and without loss of time.

Five of these partially-built ships were accordingly selected to be turned into armour-plated ships. Notwithstanding the jokes of the Secretary of the Admiralty, surgical operations were performed upon them: they were sawn in two, and lengthened to give them the necessary flotation for the increased weights they had to carry; they were immensely strengthened. Iron was freely used whenever it was necessary to give increased rigidity; armour-plates were ordered for them. Such alterations in their bows and sterns as were doubly necessary to enable them to carry their batteries completely protected, were undertaken, and preparations were thus made for an addition of five wooden armour-plated ships to the six iron ships constructed, and in the course of construction. This reinforcement, being in the hands of the Government, could be

accelerated or retarded as circumstances rendered necessary. Increased activity on the other side of the water could be met by greater efforts on this, and abated activity there would give us more time for deliberation. Our Government did not relax in its intention to place the armour-clad fleet of England on an equality with that of France; but it did not for that purpose interrupt all other work, as it might have done: it kept its resources well in hand, prepared to accelerate its pace whenever the necessity for so doing became apparent. All these ships could have been launched in August 1862, and fitted for sea before the end of the year. The only difficulty — and it is one which energy and a large expenditure of money could have overcome — would have been procuring armour-plates of the best quality; but this, though an admitted difficulty, would have been overcome if necessary.

It is as well, before going further, to say a word as to the qualities of these five ships. The principal features of their construction are, that they are armour-plated from end to end, that they carry 34 guns under armour on their main deck battery, that their rudder and steering gear are carefully protected, their bows and structure generally as much strengthened as their flotation would allow; that their speed will be between 12 and 13 knots, their rig very much lighter than the 'Warrior's,' though heavier than the French ships; their battery higher out of the water, and their guns further apart than the French ships; their powers of resisting shot, supposing the armour-plates of both to be equally good, somewhat less than the 'Warrior's,' and about equal to the 'Gloire's.'

These ships are the first English ships armour-plated from end to end, and wholly protected, which have been constructed: their behaviour at sea will be anxiously watched, for none of our iron ships have yet been subjected to the severe strain of carrying armour-plates at their extremities. The 'Gloire,' indeed, a wooden ship, has passed through some severe trials in the Gulf of Lyons, and the 'Normandie,' also armour-plated from end to end, has crossed the Atlantic and done service in the Gulf of Mexico; but a winter cruise in the North Atlantic will be a severer test of the power of wooden ships to carry heavy armour. Neither the 'Gloire' nor the 'Normandie,' however, have shown any symptoms of weakness up to this time; nor have the partially armour-cased iron ships which we have sent to sea.

The necessary preparations for altering these ships were completed in the beginning of June, and they were commenced early in that month. The preparations which had been interrupted at Chatham for building the 'Achilles' of iron were

resumed: a new design was prepared to give the ship increased flotation, and in August the building of this new iron-clad ship in our dockyard was put in hand. The main features of the design were those of the 'Warrior,' with modifications of importance at the bow and stern.

Meanwhile plans for building three additional iron ships to be armour-plated were under consideration. It was wished to avoid the exposed extremities of the 'Warrior' and 'Black Prince,' and to retain the maximum of speed obtained or expected in these ships. To enable the new ships to carry the additional weight of armour required to protect them from stem to stern, (upwards of 800 tons), and still to retain the extreme speed which was expected from the lighter ships, was a difficult problem to solve. Large as was the 'Warrior,' serious as were the difficulties as to docks and harbours involved in that great size, manifold as were the disadvantages attending manœuvring in ships of the 'Warrior's' length, it was necessary still further to enlarge the new design. The plan proposed, and ultimately decided on, was that of a ship 400 feet in length, of increased sectional area and greater horse power, to meet these requirements. These three ships, the 'Minotaur,' 'Northumberland' and 'Agincourt,' were to be built in private yards; and early in September the contracts were signed, and the work upon them begun.

This then was the state of our iron-clad fleet present and prospective, so far as regarded ships which we may call ships of the line, in the middle of 1861. We expected on the 1st of January 1863 to find ourselves with six iron armour-clad ships ready for sea, furnished to us by private builders, and with five wooden ships, armour-plated, built in our own dockyards. One iron ship, armour-plated, the 'Achilles,' which should have been three quarters built in our dockyards at Chatham, and three iron ships, which should also have been three quarters built by private companies, represented the progress we had a right to expect, in addition to what has already been referred to. But, in fact, the progress of the French iron-clads did not demand extraordinary haste in completing our own.

The two iron ships contracted for in January 1861 were not delivered, both were many months behind the time agreed upon; only half the amount of work which had been calculated on had been accomplished on the three iron ships ordered in September 1861; and the 'Achilles,' building in the Government yard at Chatham, had not advanced towards completion with anything like the rapidity originally contemplated. In the month of January 1863 England had, however, four iron-clad iron ships

actually at sea ; France had the same number of wooden ships, armour-clad, in commission ready for service, and two more nearly ready for sea : England had also one wooden armour-clad ship about to go to sea, and one iron armour-clad ship nearly ready. In addition to this prospective reinforcement, England had two wooden armour-cased ships, which could be completed sooner than the most advanced iron-cased ships of France not yet launched. Thus, in the number of iron-clad ships of the line ready for hostilities, there is practically no great difference between the two navies at present, though as much can hardly be said for their equality in other respects.

From what has preceded, it will appear that the whole of our iron-clad navy originated in 1861 and in the two years preceding. And this date has a most important bearing on all that has been said of the quality, powers of resistance and of offence of these ships in two ways : First, the ships were designed to resist the powers of artillery as known at that time ; Secondly, they were designed to supply an immediate want, which events might at any moment invest with an urgency and importance not easy to exaggerate.

When these ships were designed the artillery to be resisted consisted of spherical cast-iron shot and shell — the most effective of the former being the 68-lb. shot, and of the latter the 8 and 10-inch shells, fired from smooth-bored cast-iron guns. Sir W. Armstrong was, it is true, making rapid progress with wrought-iron rifled guns ; the 40-pounders were recognised as valuable guns, and began to be used in all our ships. His 100-pounder was under trial, and had so far succeeded that its projectiles, consisting of 110-pounder and 120-pounder solid wrought and cast-iron shot\*, besides various kinds of shells from the same gun, were also to be provided against ; and, indeed, a very general opinion prevailed that these projectiles were far more to be feared than any which could be discharged from a smooth-bored gun of the old construction.

The French had made considerable progress in rifling their cast-iron guns, which they strengthened and adapted for elongated projectiles driven by very moderate charges of powder : but at that time this artillery had not succeeded in piercing good iron plates of  $4\frac{1}{2}$ -inches thick, as has been done since.

Such experiments as had been made against iron plates

---

\* As some readers may be puzzled by the different weights of shot thrown by the same gun, we may explain that the difference arises from the more or less elongated form which may be given to the projectile.



fastened to the sides of wooden ships or representative targets had established the invulnerability of an ordinary ship's side if protected with good  $4\frac{1}{2}$ -inch plates against any known projectiles, and a special committee of officers charged to inquire into the subject had ratified this opinion by a report dated March 1860.

The Whitworth projectile had, it is true, shown greater powers of penetration than those of the ordinary description; but much difficulty having been experienced in loading, and the gun itself having burst after a very few rounds, the general conclusion arrived at was the following, from the report above referred to:—

That vessels clothed in rolled iron plates of  $4\frac{1}{2}$ -inch thickness are to all practical purposes invulnerable against any projectile that can at present be brought to bear against them at any range.

The example of our precursors in armour-plating ships had pointed in exactly the same direction—viz., that  $4\frac{1}{2}$ -inch good plates, with a thick wooden side behind them, constituted a sufficient defence against ordinary guns, and a complete protection against shells, the infallible destroyers of any purely wooden structure.

All the iron-clads therefore, six in number, designed prior to the spring of 1861 were, as far as the armour-plating was concerned, conceived on the same principle; that is to say,  $4\frac{1}{2}$ -inch iron plates were applied against a strong backing of solid teak 18 inches thick outside the ribs and iron skin of the ship proper, and, as will be shown subsequently, the protection thus given was perfect against the power of ordinary guns. But our authorities, not blind to the progress making by artillery, nor to the necessity of thoroughly investigating the nature and properties of iron plates, and the powers they possessed of resisting projectiles, named in January 1861 a committee of scientific and practical men, to inquire thoroughly into the latter subject, and gave directions for such experiments to be made by actual artillery practice as should tend to throw light on the whole subject.

It is out of place here to give any history of the proceedings of that committee, of the valuable additions to our knowledge of the properties of iron which followed the elaborate experiments they have ever since been engaged in making. It will be sufficient to state that, on the 21st of October 1861, a target representing a portion of the side of the 'Warrior' was fired at by the heaviest guns and largest charges of powder at that time used both from smooth bore and from Sir W. Arm-

strong's rifled guns, and that no shots penetrated through the target. 'The verdict had gone emphatically for the defendant,' as was observed by an eminent person who witnessed the awful pounding the target had received. This trial had established two important points: first, the practical invulnerability of the six iron ships ordered up to January 1861, and of the 'Achilles,' commenced in August 1861; secondly and incidentally, that the Armstrong projectiles had proved, on the whole, no more destructive to the armour-plates than the 68-lb. shot. The five wooden ships ordered to be plated were sufficiently protected, inasmuch as  $4\frac{1}{2}$ -inch plates attached to ships' sides had over and over again, at a distance of 200 yards, resisted the penetration of 68-lb. shots, provided the plates were ordinarily good.

There remained, however, the three ships ordered from private builders in September 1861, whose armour-plating was on a different principle, and the soundness of which was not tested by this experiment. The experiments of the Iron Plate Committee had led them to the conclusion, that up to a certain thickness of plate, which appeared to be limited solely by the difficulty of manufacturing very thick plates of as good quality as thinner plates, the resistance to projectiles increased as the square of the thickness. If, then,  $5\frac{1}{2}$ -inch plates of good quality could be procured, it was certain that an equal amount of protection would be afforded to the ship with a smaller amount of wood or even iron backing behind the armour-plate. It was in every way desirable to dispense with as much wood behind the armour-plate as possible, and so, by diminishing the absolute thickness of the ship's side, to obtain important advantages in working the guns of the ship, provided always the same amount of invulnerability was maintained. The three ships above referred to were designed therefore to carry  $5\frac{1}{2}$ -inch armour-plates over 9 inches of teak backing outside the skin and ribs of the ship proper, instead of the arrangement adopted in the 'Warrior;' but as some uncertainty still prevailed as to whether good  $5\frac{1}{2}$ -inch plates could be manufactured, the Admiralty reserved to themselves the power of reverting to the 'Warrior' system at the end of three months from the date of signing the contract, without incurring any additional charge from the contractor, if subsequent experience should make such a course appear desirable to them—the difficulty to be got over during the interval being the proper manufacturing of  $5\frac{1}{2}$ -inch plates. At a later date the report of experiments carried on at Portsmouth by Captain Hewlett against  $5\frac{1}{2}$ -inch plates was to the effect that the indentation produced by shot on  $5\frac{1}{2}$ -inch plates was

shallower than on  $4\frac{1}{2}$ -inch plates, and the injury done to the fibre less; upon which grounds he suggested the adoption of the thicker plates, with less backing. But after the memorable victory of the 'Warrior' target over its assailant on the 21st of October, 1861, two classes of men resolved to devote their powers to reverse the triumph of what may be called the defence: one class represented the iron interest, waging implacable war against wood in all shapes; the other represented the powers of destruction embodied in the scientific and practical artillerists of the day, who, stimulated by defeat, looked angrily at the 'Warrior' target, declaring 'Delenda est Carthago.'

The 'iron men' advocated iron backing to the armour-plating, denied the use of wood, exaggerated the evils and imperfections of the mode of attaching armour-plates to the ship proper, and were very wisely allowed to put their theories to the proof. Three of the most ingenious and most confident amongst many eminent 'iron men' were allowed to erect targets at the public expense, to represent what they considered the proper method of constructing the armour-protected side of a ship, all three agreeing on one point only, that nothing was so bad as wood or so good as iron. These three parties were the Iron Plate Committee, represented by Mr. Fairbairn and Mr. Samuda, an eminent civil engineer and iron shipbuilder, and Mr. Scott Russell, also an iron shipbuilder and naval architect of high reputation. But while these able men were preparing their several designs, the artillerists were not idle. A 300-pounder gun had been constructed on Sir W. Armstrong's plan, and before the completion of the last-named experimental targets, this monster stood grimly confronting them. It had been subjected to proofs and experiments of no ordinary nature, the charge of powder had been of exceptional magnitude, the initial velocities obtained by the projectile startling to think of, and the chance of resisting such blows as the iron plates would be exposed to small indeed. The Committee's plan of a target had been tried on the 29th of June, 1861, and again with some modifications on the 4th of March, 1862, without giving any results at all superior to the 'Warrior' plan. An improved plan by Mr. Fairbairn was finally tried on the 8th of April, 1862; it represented iron upon iron, and was a somewhat lighter construction, foot for foot, than the 'Warrior' target: it also failed to show any superiority to the original wood-backed target.

On the 20th of May, 1862, a target (iron upon iron) designed by Mr. Samuda, slightly heavier than an equal one of the 'Warrior's' pattern, was brought under the fire not only of the guns smooth-bored and rifled, used against the 'Warrior' and

the Committee's target, but of the formidable 300-pounder, the projectile being a solid shot of 150 lbs., fired with 30 lbs. of powder. The ordinary fire did more mischief to this target than to the 'Warrior's'—the extraordinary fire penetrated it.

The third target (iron upon iron), planned by Mr. Scott Russell, much heavier than the 'Warrior's' target, area for area, was more completely ruined than the other targets, though the penetration of the exceptional projectile was not so complete, owing to the extra thickness of the iron backing to the armour-plates; and so far against ordinary projectiles the victory clearly remained with the 'Warrior' target. But against this shattered and sorely-tried 'Warrior' it was resolved to bring the full power of the new gun; and four shots were fired at it, two with 40 lbs. of powder, and two with 50 lbs. The two first struck close together; and at the edge of two adjoining plates, the target representing the ship's side was fairly penetrated by the second shot: the other two shots struck on portions of the side where the structure was firmly supported by baulks of timber, and did not penetrate the ship, though the contrary was affirmed at the time. But though the target so far yielded to the unforeseen power of the new and exceptional gun, its proved superiority over its iron rivals vindicated the propriety of the course followed in constructing the armour-plated ships, and established still more firmly the advantage of a backing of wood. We need not follow the progress of the artillerists, for it was evident that they could build guns faster than anyone could build the ships, and that if they could overcome the manufacturing difficulties attending the making of such powerful guns, the verdict of October 1861, for the defendant, must infallibly be reversed.

One other experiment, as bearing directly upon the ship-building part of the question, must, however, be referred to. It has been stated that in the three iron ships ordered in September 1861, acting upon such knowledge as was then possessed, the thickness of the iron plates was increased from  $4\frac{1}{2}$  inches to  $5\frac{1}{2}$  inches, and that the wood-backing was decreased by the weight equivalent to that additional inch of iron: that is to say, from 18 inches to 9 inches. A target representing a section of the ships so designed was fired at on the 7th of July, 1862. It offered less resistance to the 150-lb. shot than the 'Warrior' target, but greater to the 68-lb. shot; on the fourth round, however, the so-called 300-pounder burst, and it seemed as if ship and gun had mutually destroyed each other.

It was only natural that a ship's side designed to resist what was known to be the power of 68 lbs. and 110-pounder guns in 1861, should be penetrated by a 150-lb. shot propelled by

50 lbs. of powder, and no disappointment should have been felt at the result. But though the improved target was unable to resist the 150-pounder, those who witnessed the experiments felt no doubt that against such guns as it was originally intended to resist, the 'Minotaur' target was an advance upon the 'Warrior,' and further advantage also was to be expected in the improved manufacture of  $5\frac{1}{2}$ -inch plates, which would result from mere practice.\*

Thus, then, it may be assumed that, so far as our knowledge of artillery and armour-plates then extended, and, we may add, so far as the judgment of those whose attention had been specially directed to the subject can be relied on, the course pursued in preparing our iron-clad fleet in the year 1861 was eminently judicious. It was guided by the experience carefully obtained as to the power of artillery and resistance of iron armour; the way was felt by careful experiments before running into unnecessary expense; private enterprise and inventive power were extensively used, but without entirely relying on those over whom Government could exercise no effective control. A reserve of ships was wisely kept in our own dockyards, to be hastened forward or delayed, as circumstances might require; and whatever may be said of these converted line-of-battle ships being inferior to iron-built ships originally designed for iron-clads, by no other means could we so speedily have attained an equality with our rivals. There was also the great advantage, that the ships building in our own yards could be altered and improved as experience might suggest, without the evils attending every deviation from a contract.

It must not be forgotten that neither France nor England made anything like the same progress with their iron-clad fleet that was anticipated, or that either Power might have done had all their energies been directed to this point alone. It is enough to say that, such being the case, the efforts made by the latter have been sufficient not only to keep pace with

---

\* We have reason to believe that the progress of artillery in France, under the able direction of Colonel Treuille de Beaulieu, is at least equal to our own. The French are now trying a heavy rifled cannon of twenty-two centimetres bore, weighing fourteen tons, and throwing a 160 pound shot 6,000 yards with perfect accuracy. This enormous piece is provided with a revolving platform, so arranged that a single gunner can direct and point it as easily as a fowling-piece. The projectile can also be converted into a shell loaded with eight pounds of powder. Guns of this calibre are intended for the defence of the French coast.

the former, but to render it easy in future years to redress the balance of inequality which has for some time existed. But this is only one half the task that the administration of a naval Power like Great Britain had to perform. It had not only to provide for a great naval action to be fought perhaps for its existence, but to guard the national flag and colonial possessions in every part of the world, and to protect a commerce of unequalled magnitude and importance. Supplementary to the line-of-battle force which France and England were creating, each Power was considering how its own ports might be secured from hostile attacks by sea, and how best it could annoy and disturb its neighbour's preparations in their own arsenals. For each Power, then, floating batteries became a necessity—vessels of great powers of offence and defence, not necessarily capable of proceeding further to sea than a short trip across the narrow waters of the Channel, or a coasting voyage in the waters of the Mediterranean. In the preparation of such vessels France was, in 1861, far ahead of us. In that year she had five floating batteries built during the Crimean war, and reported as being still in a good state, and fit for service.

Two smaller ones, recently built, were receiving their engines and armour-plating. Two more of the same class were on the stocks building, and were ready for plating. Four others were designed, though no progress had been made in their construction. There were, however, nine of these ships in actual existence, besides some iron-clad gunboats in course of preparation, and exclusive of the four batteries designed but not commenced. At this time England had afloat eight of these batteries, constructed for the Crimean war. Four were of wood and four of iron. Three out of the four wooden ones were in so bad a state as to be unfit for service without large repairs; the fourth was in so rotten a state that she was taken to pieces during the year. The four iron batteries might be considered serviceable, but one was at Bermuda.

As it was evident that this inequality could not safely be allowed to continue, and that preparations must be made to replace the old not very efficient batteries by vessels of a superior class, the attention of the Government was called to the invention of a most ingenious and able naval officer, Captain Cowper Coles, who had long turned his attention to placing heavy guns on a turn-table, and surrounding them with a shield or cupola, armour-plated, and capable of resisting the heaviest projectiles of the day. He had laboured indefatigably at his invention, which had been for some time under the consideration of the War Office, for it was

equally adapted to a fixed fortification on land as to a moving battery afloat. In April 1861, the Admiralty directed a shield, originally intended for land defence, to be erected in one of the floating batteries, with a view of testing its capabilities by ascertaining both the actual facilities for working and fighting a gun so mounted and protected, and its powers of resisting the heaviest guns that could be brought against it. In August the shield had resisted effectually such artillery as was then ready for service, and it had also been ascertained that the gun on its turn-table worked with the greatest ease, and was pointed with remarkable rapidity.

Captain Coles, having thus established the principle of his revolving shield or cupola, even in its imperfect state (for this shield was not designed for a ship but for a fort), now proposed an enlarged plan of cupola which should contain two 100-pounder Armstrongs, then considered the most formidable artillery known; and it was resolved to make a trial of this shield with the guns. A design was meanwhile in course of preparation for a floating battery that should carry six of these shields, armour-plated from end to end, have considerable speed and not excessive draught of water, to be built of iron, and to be for harbour and coast defence. If upon further trial this invention should be found to realise what was expected of it, a vessel so armed would prove herself as a moving battery for smooth water superior to everything afloat. Many unsuitable and impossible designs were proposed with this object. The arrangements required were novel and complicated, and considerable time was occupied in perfecting them. A most favourable report of the trials of the shield at sea was received March 1862, and in the same month the design above referred to was put in hand.

Captain Coles exhibited the greatest ingenuity in overcoming all the difficulties of adapting a ship to carry these constructions, and by his perseverance and the skill of the Constructor's Department of the Admiralty, all obstacles were got over; and the '*Prince Albert*,' an iron ship, armour-plated all round up to her deck, and at that time intended to carry six shields of the same size, and armed in the same way as that which had been so favourably reported on by Captain Hewlett, was contracted for.

The original design has been departed from; the experiments made at Shoeburyness, in the course of 1862, showed that the 100-pounder Armstrong gun was not the limit of the artillerists' power — 300 and 600-pounders were looming in the distance. The former had, it is true, after smashing some targets, blown itself to pieces; yet it was clear that larger and more powerful

guns were sufficiently near their realisation to make it incumbent on the Constructor's Department to provide for their use. This, at Captain Coles's earnest request, was accordingly done. He enlarged and altered the shape of his shields, added greatly to their strength, and of course to their weight; and the 'Prince Albert' will now carry four shields instead of six, and be armed with the best gun that the artillerists shall have provided in the course of the ensuing year.

The Government, however, though proceeding cautiously, and satisfying themselves by actual experiment of the soundness of the principles on which they were acting with regard to their floating batteries, had seriously considered whether some of the large line-of-battle ships built of wood, of which we possessed so many, could not be turned to some useful account. Obviously, in their present condition, they were little else than mere bundles of matches, which would infallibly be destroyed after a few broadsides by incendiary projectiles. It was true that upon any similarly constructed wooden ship they could inflict a similar destruction to that which they were certain to undergo; reserving therefore a certain number of such ships to meet any vessels of this nature which might be opposed to us, there remained a large surplus available for other purposes; and plans were under consideration for turning some at least of these ships either into ordinary armour-plated block ships, or into superior floating batteries, armed with Coles's revolving shields. At this moment the news of the action between the 'Monitor' and 'Merrimac' arrived, and produced such an impression on the public mind, that there was no longer any hesitation about converting any suitable wooden ship into an armour-clad vessel of war.

The 'Royal Sovereign' was accordingly selected, cut down to her lower deck beams, strengthened and prepared to carry five of the largest shields, and the heaviest guns that could be put into them. An outline of the plans ultimately determined upon for this ship may prove interesting. The 'Royal Sovereign' was a new three-decked ship of 130 guns, and engines of 800 horse power; her tonnage was about 4,000, her mean draught of water at her load line was 26 feet, and her estimated speed was about 12 knots. The difference between the weights removed and those added to the ship would, it was calculated, lighten the ship, and diminish her mean draught of water by about 3 feet. She was to be entirely armour-plated with  $5\frac{1}{2}$  inches of iron; and after various modifications of the original design, it was settled that she should carry four shields capable of fighting the largest guns that were in course of construction.



In both of these floating batteries two important results were arrived at and obtained—smaller draught of water than any of the iron-clad ships, and dimensions which would render the different docks and basins in the Government establishments available for their use. To obtain these results high speed was dispensed with, and only such dimensions were insisted on as would enable the structures to be as strong as possible, and to give flotation to the requisite weight. When these ships shall have been tried at sea, many points about which there is still some doubt and hesitation will be cleared up; and it is not impossible that the great object of Captain Coles's ambition, the construction of a sea-going shield-ship may be found to present no insurmountable obstacles.

But while thus providing the materials for the line-of-battle, both in wood and iron, and this addition to the armour-clad floating batteries, the wants of our commerce in distant seas, and the protection necessary to afford to our colonial possessions, naturally turned the attention of our Government to the construction of iron-plated ships, which should be as fitted for cruising or ocean navigation as our former unprotected wooden men-of-war. It was soon evident that the difficulties of constructing such ships would be very great, the problem being to carry great weights on very restricted dimensions, to ensure perfect sea-going qualities, and yet to protect the ship in such a manner that, while she could scarcely be injured herself by any thing but an iron-clad ship, she should be able to destroy any wooden unprotected ship that she might come across, and finally to provide for her crew air, light, and health as completely as in an ordinary ship. None of these objects could be secured without placing the deck as high out of water in proportion to the vessel's length as experience in ordinary ships had proved to be absolutely necessary. In none of the iron-clad ships of either France or England had this most necessary result as yet been obtained; and without it all ships of war are imperfect cruisers, and in a greater or less degree unfit for distant and protracted service.

Various plans were proposed to the Admiralty, but all had the same tendency to those enormous dimensions, excessive cost of time and money, which it was so desirable to avoid; but a design prepared by Mr. Reed, a naval architect, not in the employment of the Government, but well known for his writings on professional subjects, and secretary to the Institution of Naval Architects, seemed to meet all the difficulties and satisfy the requirements of the case. The general plan consisted of two features—one was that it turned to account the number of

small vessels on the stocks in different stages of preparation, instead of absolutely condemning them, and wasting the material already prepared; the other was the mounting a limited number of large guns in the centre of the ships, to protect by armour-plates the battery, the engines, magazines, rudder, and all the vital parts of the ship above and below the water line. It was intended also so to distribute the weights that the great mass of them should be centralised in the ship, and that the general immersion of the whole body should be no greater than before. By this plan ships of less than 1,000 tons could be protected in the manner described, and yet carry a battery of four guns of the largest size also protected. Other details, both novel and ingenious, may be passed over, as they are of a technical nature; but the plan was accepted by the Admiralty, and the superintendence of its execution entrusted to Mr. Reed. On this design two sloops of 4 guns each, the 'Enterprise' and 'Research,' are constructing, which are intended, like armour-plated ships, for a distant service. A corvette, the 'Favorite,' of 8 guns, and a frigate, the 'Zealous,' of 16 guns, are also rapidly advancing, both designed upon the principle referred to.

All these ships are building from materials already prepared and paid for; they are adaptations of ships partially built to a new purpose, and compared with the other iron-clads are of small dimensions and moderate draught of water.

The new work, therefore, undertaken in 1862 relative to the preparing of our iron-clad fleet may thus be recapitulated: Two powerful floating batteries on the shield principle, and four cruising sea-going armour-plated ships, intended for any service that a wooden ship can perform—a force, it may be said, which no other maritime Power as yet possesses.

In looking back through the brief history of armour-plated ships, we see that the progress of penetrating—we will not say destroying—force has been greater than that of the resisting power; and the result as regards land artillery *versus* ships is inevitable, for the size and power of guns cannot be easily limited, while there are all but insuperable obstacles to a great increase in the thickness and consequent weight of a ship's armour. We mean, of course, a real sea-going ship, subject to all the force of a tempest-tossed ocean, and requiring the speed and ready steerage essential in naval warfare; we may add, having to carry the coals, provisions, stores, armament, and crew of an efficient ship of war.

Late experiments have shown us good plates of  $7\frac{1}{2}$  inches in thickness pierced not only by shot but by shell. Mr. Whitworth, in the autumn of last year, exploded shells with facility

through a representation of the 'Warrior's' side. It is true that cast-iron shot and shell will not do this, but the special weapon will do the special work; and the naval architect may be sure that, if he clothes his ship in 11-inch armour, the artillery will at a given day, and at a given expenditure of money, pass a shell through it.

Are we then to return to unprotected ships? By no means; these experiments of artillery against armour-plates are to be considered exceptional, or, at the most, as showing what guns on a 'fixed fortress' are likely to be able to do against those on a floating fortress. It is not said that exceptional guns, exceptional projectiles, and exceptional gunpowder—for it must be understood that these results have only been obtained by the use of all three of these exceptional means, involving a cost by no means accurately ascertained—may not in process of time be the ordinary means of warfare, though hitherto, at any rate, the victory that the guns have obtained over the target has invariably been closely followed by their own destruction. But at present these guns exist only as specimens, and as specimens utterly deficient in endurance. It is more than probable that the gun and the projectile which the 'Warrior' will have to resist, if she meets an iron-clad of any other maritime Power afloat, will be adequately resisted by her side. The ordinary French gun on board their ships is a 'canon de 30,' rifled, throwing 100-lb. shot\* with no very great initial velocity and penetration, nothing more formidable than what we are prepared to encounter. There are, doubtless, some breach-loading rifled guns in the 'Gloire' of exceptional power; they are on their trial: it is premature to speak of what will be the future of this armament. M. Raymond gives a very favourable account of them. We hear, too, of the 15-inch guns of the Americans, but we also hear that structures every way weaker than the 'Warrior' resist the projectiles thrown by those guns. But whatever may be the power of artillery afloat—and it is that with which we are principally concerned; however hard the struggle may be to maintain the balance between the attack and defence, we have no alternative left—that struggle must be made, our path is clear before us. If thicker plates and heavier sides are necessary, they must be given; if gigantic dimensions are required for this purpose, the sacrifice must be made.

Few and heavy guns mounted in the centre of a ship, with the

---

\* M. Raymond tells us that the shot thrown by these guns weighs 99·180 pounds with a charge of 16·530 pounds of powder, and that at 40 yards they penetrate  $4\frac{1}{2}$ -inch plates easily.

water-line and vital parts protected, will still enable us, at a cost of perhaps 50,000*l.* per gun, to carry these floating structures wherever there is water enough for them to swim: but let not the public be deceived—gigantic guns mean gigantic ships, gigantic docks, harbours, basins, and gigantic annual bills, and now and then gigantic losses. If the object of a navy like that of England is to defend her commerce and protect her possessions on every side, these gigantic and costly guardians must be multiplied in proportion to the spread of commerce and to the number of possessions.

The 'Warrior' ready for sea represents 400,000*l.* of the public money, and this only defended partially by  $4\frac{1}{2}$ -inch plates; the 'Minotaur,' wholly protected by  $5\frac{1}{2}$ -inch plates, when ready for sea, will represent 500,000*l.*; and both  $4\frac{1}{2}$  and  $5\frac{1}{2}$ -inch plates have been pierced and shattered by guns already in existence. What then will be the cost of ships where 8 or 10-inch plating should be adopted? Limit the number of guns as we may, immense dimensions will be required to float such structures, immense cost to complete them, and the days when a large reduction of the navy estimates shall be practicable seem farther than ever from our reach.

It may be true that the iron-clad ships of France are less adapted for cruising than ours, and that they seem to have been constructed wholly for the purpose of fighting a great naval action for supremacy at sea, so that so large a multiplication of our iron-clad ships as has been hinted at for the protection of our commerce and colonial empire may not be requisite; yet the power France undoubtedly possesses of detaching these ships has just been exemplified by the proceedings of the 'Normandie,' and is instructive in pointing out to us that, in distant regions of the world, the honour of our flag and the safety of our possessions cannot be trusted to unprotected wooden ships.

What is passing on the shores and in the inland waters of the great American Continent must add impressiveness, if any were needed, to this lesson. That country resounds from one end to the other with the din of preparation and construction of iron-clad ships. Those ships, it is true, were built for a special purpose, and are not formidable, except on their own waters. But sea-going iron-clads are building, and will before long be ready to carry the flag of the stars and stripes wherever the policy of their Government may choose to send them. The American practice differs essentially from that pursued in Europe, and in nothing more than the great size and weight of the guns deliberately adopted. Although the first contest between two iron-clads took place in their waters, and has

been commented on again and again, less has been practically learnt from the engagement between the 'Merrimac' and 'Monitor' than could have been supposed. We know, it is true, how the 'Monitor' was constructed, but we do not know what that construction had to resist, what was the weight of those projectiles that did not harm her, with what velocity they were discharged, nor of what substance they were composed. On the other hand, we do not know of what material the armour-plating was composed, nor exactly in what manner the 'Merrimac' was protected by it; though we do know exactly with what projectiles she was battered, and very nearly what resistance she offered. The report of Captain Dahlgren, presented to Congress in December 1862, gives some interesting details of this action, and confirms what has been stated above. We also know that both ships were entirely unfit for navigating the open sea, and that the ship or ships which the American Government will send to sea must infallibly partake of the type of such ships as England and France have constructed for this purpose. The Americans are confident that they can carry and work at sea 15-inch guns, throwing 450-lb. shot with charges of powder sufficient to pierce and destroy a ship's side composed of 36 inches of solid oak and 1-inch iron lining, protected by  $5\frac{1}{2}$  inches of solid armour-plating; they have in this way destroyed a target at 100 yards' distance, and they have done this with cast-iron guns and cast-iron shot.

However exceptional all this may be at present, however impracticable it may at present appear to work such guns in a ship in motion, it will not do to shut our eyes to these eventualities. In designing those additional iron-clads, which it is but too evident England will be compelled to build, the increasing difficulties of the question must be fairly considered, and the magnitude of the cost boldly confronted.

Whether these ships shall be built of wood or iron, it is not the object of these pages to discuss. From what has been said in Parliament and other places, it does, however, appear desirable that iron ship-building should not be confined to one government establishment only, or that, in so vital a matter as the power of constructing a fleet, the public safety should be entirely confided to private firms. Contracts between Government and such firms cannot in all cases, as, for instance, in cases of insolvency, be enforced by Government, but they preclude any deviation except at an immense expense to the public. As auxiliaries, private firms are invaluable, but it might be a fatal error to regard them as principals.

Our past experience shows that constructing ships of war in private yards often ends in bitter disappointments to both parties, and in enormous cost to the country. The very fact that the men to whom the building of iron ships has been entrusted are amongst the most eminent and trustworthy in the country, the zeal and perseverance with which they have contended against all difficulties, and the superior excellence of the work they have accomplished, coupled with the delays, the disappointments, and the totally unforeseen cost of these ships — a cost so largely in excess of what either the Government or the builder foresaw — warn us clearly against too great an extension of such a system. When we see that such firms as Messrs. Napier of Glasgow, the Thames Ship Building Company, Messrs. Laird of Birkenhead, and others who are decidedly at the head of their profession, with all their energies, with all the means at their disposal, have taken so long and incurred such cost to accomplish what they have done; and when we see that other contractors have wholly failed in what they had undertaken, we are warned against an entire surrender of such national work as fleet building to private enterprise. It is true that the former want of system and of organisation in our dockyards caused a general wish to see the work transferred to those enterprising companies who so successfully managed their own affairs. But, in the first place, whatever were the faults of our dockyard system, or of any other part of our naval administration, they were surely capable of remedy by a well-considered reform; and, in the second place, to entrust to ordinary ship-builders the whole work of our dockyards would be to impose upon a dwarf the work of a giant. The experience of the last three years has shown that the same firm which derives credit and profit from undertakings in which it has experience will fail to obtain either in the costly and exceptional work of building ships of war. The materials of our iron navy must still be supplied by private enterprise; but even to obtain them of the necessary quality is exceedingly difficult, and no better proof can be given than the immense proportion returned as being below the required standard. Thus, of iron building plates (technically called ship plates and boat plates) varying from  $\frac{3}{8}$ ths to  $1\frac{1}{8}$ ths in thickness, which form the principal part ( $\frac{1}{10}$ ths perhaps) of a ship of war, the total supply is immense; but the proportion capable of bearing the different trials is very small. The best iron of the kind will bear a tensile strain with the fibre of 23 to 45 tons per square inch, and across the fibre of 15 to 25 tons. Now, as it is a well-known axiom that the strength of a fabric is equal to that of its

weakest part, Government very properly have fixed a standard to ensure a fair average quality of iron. That standard is a strength equal to 22 tons lengthways of the grain, and 19 tons across it per square inch, being far below the average of the best iron: there are also certain smithery tests of heating, bending, and punching, when hot and when cold, which good iron ought to stand. But the custom of the iron trade is to produce large quantities of these plates which will only bear a strain of 14 tons in one direction and 8 or 9 in the other. It is with iron of this quality that our markets are stocked, and that many packets and merchant vessels are built; but to use them in our iron-clads would be madness.\* Nor is it only the low-priced iron that is found to be so weak, for hundreds of tons of the high-priced material have been from time to time rejected both at Chatham and in the contract yards. This will explain why, notwithstanding the vaunted (and justly vaunted) powers of private enterprise, much is promised or offered to Government, but little, comparatively, is done. It would also still further justify, were that necessary, the course taken in converting useless wooden ships into very serviceable iron-clads. The attacks made upon the Controller of the Navy upon this subject during the present session were clearly unjust, for, although it was boldly asserted, it was by no means proved, that without these ships we could occupy the position we now do in reference to the French navy. If it was a blunder on the part of our naval authorities to persist in laying down wooden line-of-battle ships when the days of such ships were numbered, it was a happy idea which turned that blunder to such excellent purpose as has been done in the case of the 'Royal Oak.' That success, guaranteeing as it does similar success with the other 'converted' ships, is a great triumph for the building department, and extricated this country from a position of inferiority alike dangerous and discreditable.

But although with an able and energetic man in the Controller's Office, we can build good ships, and meet an emergency with credit and success, as we have just seen, there is something harder to build up and to maintain than a fleet, and fully as essential. There is the moral strength which grows out of discipline—out of confidence in, and respect for, the ruling powers—there is the zeal for the public service, the contentment, the *esprit de corps*, the conscious power and the general smooth working of the whole machine, which a wise organisation at headquarters can alone produce.

---

\* We would again call attention to the article on 'Iron' published in this Journal, No. 235., p. 204. The subject is one of the gravest national importance, especially to the navy.

ART. VII.—1. *Memoirs communicated to the Royal Geographical Society, June 22nd, 1863.* By Captain SPEKE.

2. *Anniversary Address, May 25th, 1863.* By Sir RODERICK IMPEY MURCHISON, K.C.B., President of the Royal Geographical Society.

3. *Papers communicated to the Ethnological Society, June 30th, 1863.* By Captain AUGUSTUS GRANT.

THE two captains sent by the British Government, at the solicitation of the Royal Geographical Society, to discover the sources of the Nile, have been more fortunate than the two centurions despatched by Nero on a similar errand. There may exist doubts as to the exhaustiveness of their search; there may prove to be other tributaries of the Nile flowing from the east or from the west, from more distant fountain-heads than Speke and Grant have seen; but this much appears certain, that these explorers have traced the trunk stream of the river of Egypt to its exit from the Lake Nianza, and that a southern limit of latitude has also been determined, within which the tributaries of the lake must necessarily lie.

The most striking popular fact to be deduced from the present exploration is, that the Nile is far the longest river in the world, at least in one of the two senses of that epithet. When we measure its deposed predecessor, the Mississippi, in a direct line between its mouth and the head of its remotest tributary, we find the distance to be about 1,740 miles; the corresponding measurement of the Nile is no less than 2,380. If, on the other hand, we care to measure the course of either stream in its main features, by following their principal bends with a pair of compasses, we obtain 2,450 for the Mississippi, against 3,050 for the Nile. We have not patience to inquire into the minute meanderings of either stream; indeed, the exceedingly tortuous course of the upper part of the latter river is still unmapped with accuracy. There is no other river on the globe that links such different climates as the Nile, none that is so remarkable for its physical peculiarities, none that is clothed with equal historical interest, and none that has so attracted or so baffled the theorist and the explorer. Let us state, in a few words, the slow steps by which its investigation had hitherto advanced, before we narrate the adventures of the party by whom it has, at length, been accomplished.

All the world knows that tourists may sail readily up the Nile from its mouth, if they wish it, to the second cataract, a distance of 750 miles, neglecting the meanderings of the river;



and they also know that a further course of 700 miles, partly navigable with ease and partly with great difficulty, takes the traveller to Khartûm, where the Blue and White branches combine. Their united volume forms the identical stream that intersects the whole breadth of the Sahara with a thread of habitable land; for not a single tributary, except the Atbâra—and that is almost dry in summer, while its mouth is barely 180 miles below Khartûm—adds anything to its volume. Bruce reached Abyssinia at the end of the last century. He acted upon the erroneous conclusion that the Blue River was the more important of the two arms. He accordingly devoted himself to exploring the Lake Dembea, whence it derives its source, and therefore he claimed the honour of having discovered the fountain head of the Nile. The Blue River was certainly the more important stream of the two, speaking socially, for it led to Abyssinia, and its banks were populous; while the White Nile led due south into morasses, and to the haunts of barbarians. There is life in the waters of the former, as they swirl past Khartûm, clear, blue, and sparkling, like a vast salmon-stream; but the huge White Nile has a forlorn and mere-like character. The size of its mouth is masked by an island; and when its undivided waters have been entered, they seem so stagnant as to suggest the idea of a backwater to the Blue Nile, rather than a sister affluent. But its breadth and depth more than compensate for the sluggishness of its current; and we now know, by better measurements than the contemporaries of Bruce were enabled to take, that its greater volume of water, as well as its far superior length, justly mark it to be the parent stream of the river of Egypt.

The White Nile was wholly neglected until M. Linant made a short expedition up it for one or two hundred miles, in 1827. His report of its size, and of the ivory, gums, and other savage products that were procurable on its banks, inflamed the curiosity and the greed of the Egyptian Government, who were then bent on extending their dominions. They sent out expeditions during three successive years, in which Arnaud and Werne took part, and explored the river for far more than 1,000 miles of water-way, terminating at or about Gondakoro, which we have at length ascertained, through Speke's observations, to be in lat.  $4^{\circ} 54' N.$  and long.  $31^{\circ} 46' E.$  Fifty or sixty miles above Gondakoro, the navigation of the river is absolutely interrupted by rapids and rocks.

Henceforward, and by slow degrees, the White Nile became a highway for competing traders, who formed stations near its banks, and trafficked in ivory and slaves. They had little

power to convey geographical knowledge, and, for the most part, they had strong pecuniary interest in withholding what they knew; so that our acquaintance with the river, in a scientific point of view, was out of all proportion inferior to its value and accessibility.

Praiseworthy attempts have been made by individuals, who were mainly incited by the earnest appeals of the French Geographical Society, and especially of its late venerable President, M. Jomard, to explore beyond Gondakoro, and to map the neighbourhood of the river; but they met with scanty success. Our maps of the high Nilotic countries are compromises of exceedingly different representations, mostly devoid of any astronomical basis; and the farthest exploration of the most successful traveller, Miani, reached only to a point which Speke has now ascertained to be in lat.  $3^{\circ} 34' N.$  As for the extraordinary sketch of Petherick's route, which that traveller laid down upon paper with a free hand, and without the slightest astronomical check, we dismiss it from our consideration. It is wholly unproved, and is, in many respects, improbable.

The failure of travellers from Gondakoro was mainly due to the distance of that place from Khartûm, whence all supplies had to be drawn, to the wretched quality of Khartûm servants, and to the disorganised and poverty-stricken character of the country immediately beyond Gondakoro. A traveller could obtain no porters at that place, beasts of burthen did not exist, yet a strong party was essential to security and progress. Success was only possible to an able leader, who could command means to take out with him an imposing expedition, so completely organised as to be independent of the natives.

While progress languished on the White Nile, and geographers were periodically tantalised and disappointed by scraps of intelligence published in the bulletin of the French Geographical Society, an entirely new base of operations was suggested to future travellers. Two missionaries, Krapf and Rebmann, directed by religious caprice, selected a small town on the east coast of Africa as their station. It is called Mombas; it lies a little to the north of Zanzibar, and in lat.  $4^{\circ} 4' S.$  They established themselves there, learnt native languages, made journeys to the interior, and published an account of what they had seen and heard. They astonished European geographers by the assertion that they had found two snow-capped mountains, whose position they fixed at an extravagant distance from the coast. Unfortunately for their credit, their narratives were too loosely recorded to endure a searching criticism; their itineraries were discussed, and their journeys were shown to have extended only

a half or a third of the distance they had claimed to have accomplished. Fanciful conclusions were also interwoven with their statements of fact. In consequence of these serious inaccuracies, a misgiving unjustly attached itself to the whole of their story. They were bitterly assailed on many sides; some persons asserted the mountains to be myths, and others believed them to exist as peaks of moderate altitude, whitened by quartz or dolomite. There were but a few who, while they acknowledged the missionaries to be unscientific, recoiled from accusing them of intentional misstatement, and refused to believe that a native of German Switzerland, like Rebmann, should mistake the character of so familiar an object as a snow mountain, when he had spent many days in its neighbourhood, and walked partly round it. We now know that the latter view was the correct one; but, at the time of which we are speaking, discussions grew exceedingly warm, and further exploration was urgently called for in Eastern Africa.

The next incident that bears upon our subject was the appearance of a map, wholly compiled from native information by Mr. Rebmann, with the assistance of another missionary, Mr. Erhardt. It included a vast territory, reaching from the eastern coast to the medial line of Africa, and was founded on the statements of travellers by several caravan routes, which were said to run parallel to one another, from the coast to the interior, at 150 miles apart, and to end, in every case, on the shores of a lake. Other information connected the routes by cross sections, and made it probable that the three lakes were one continuous sheet of water, prolonged into the Lake Maravi of the older maps. The memoir that accompanied the missionaries' sketch was composed with great ability, and could not fail to convince readers that, notwithstanding the improbability of the existence of a sheet of water of the egregious dimensions and unnatural outline ascribed to it in the sketch, there was undoubtedly a lake country of great extent at some sixty days' journey from the eastern coast, and that more than one road to it lay perfectly open to any traveller who chose to make the effort.

The labours of Mr. Cooley are too well known and too numerous to need recapitulation here. He had advocated a long narrow lake, stretching down Eastern Africa; but his arguments were based on travels that were little known to the English public, and were raised on an almost too ingenious critical basis. The same may be said, with more or less truth, of the arguments of the Abyssinian traveller, Dr. Beke, and of a crowd of others who entertained various hypotheses on the geography of various parts of Eastern Africa. They had not

the influence they deserved. It was perhaps natural that the simple statements of men writing from Africa itself, who were able to converse with numbers of travellers, including the native captains of caravan parties, who were, of all negroes, the best qualified informants, should impress the majority of geographers with a greater air of reality than learned discussions, elaborated within the sound of Bow Bells.

The discoveries, speculations, and maps of Krapf, Rebmann, and Erhardt, obtained a wide circulation, and induced theorists to suppose that the snow mountains of the missionaries were identical with the Mountains of the Moon, spoken of by Ptolemy, whence the Nile was said to rise; and they argued, on that hypothesis, that an expedition should be sent from Zanzibar to seek the sources of that river. On the other hand, there were many who urged an investigation of the Lake question, as one of great geographical interest and apparently easy solution. In fine, the Geographical Society successfully exerted itself to procure the despatch of an exploring party to Eastern Africa, to find out what they could: hence, Burton and Speke's expedition to Lake Tanganyika in 1857-9. It will be recollected that Burton, the leader of the party, suffered severely from an illness during the whole of the journey, against which he gallantly but unsuccessfully struggled. Consequently, on his arrival at Kazeh, the half-way station between Lake Tanganyika and the coast, and an entrepôt of some importance, whence a trading route diverges to the north, he despatched Speke on a solitary expedition. He was to follow that route, and to visit a great lake called Nyanza, which was clearly one of the separate lakes which the missionaries had believed to be united in one continuous sheet of water. Speke went, and reached the southern shores of an enormous inland sea in lat.  $2^{\circ} 45'$  S. and long.  $33^{\circ} 30'$  E., and therefore at a distance of 480 geographical miles from Gondakoro, and about 400 from the highest point to which the White Nile had been ascended by Miani. Recollecting this fact, and being informed that the lake extended some 400 miles in that direction (it actually does extend more than 200), and that it had a northern outlet in a river frequented by white men, Speke came to the conclusion that that river must be the Nile, and therefore that the Nyanza (or as he was pleased to call it, with questionable taste, the Victoria Nyanza) was, in a proximate sense, its long-sought source.

The present expedition of Captains Speke and Grant was planned to investigate that hypothesis. It was undertaken with the help of Government aid, granted at the earnest solicitation of the Geographical Society, and has proved the truth

of Speke's theory. We will now proceed to relate the chief incidents and the geographical results of their protracted journey.

Captains Speke and Grant left Zanzibar in October, 1860, after having despatched a caravan of natives in advance, to form a *dépôt* of goods and travelling necessities at Kazeh. The expedition was arranged on a liberal scale, though it was prepared under serious disadvantages, owing to the delays that always intervene between the time when hope is held out of Government support, and the day when it is finally given. Speke's preparatory arrangements were thrown sadly out of gear by the procrastination of officials at home, and his start was unduly hurried at the last moment. It was, in fact, retarded until the most favourable season of the year had passed. They started with a motley caravan, consisting, first, of sixty armed men from Zanzibar, who were engaged to serve them throughout the journey, and who carried the travellers' personal luggage; next came an army of local porters, laden with goods of exchange, such as beads and calico; and to these was added a curious detachment which had been pressed upon them, with the kindest intentions, by Sir George Grey, then Governor of the Cape. It consisted of a number of Hottentot soldiers. They were an utter and a costly failure; for the difference of climate between their native droughts and the steaming vegetation of the coast opposite Zanzibar, was too great for their constitutions to withstand. Many died, and the others were useless from ill-health, as well as from their ignorance of the language, habits, and methods of locomotion of Eastern Africa, and they had to be sent back. Some mules and donkeys were taken, but they also proved a failure. The great journey had to be performed on foot.

No African caravan-track could have been less obstructed than the road to Kazeh, when Speke travelled along it in the company of Burton: on the present occasion, the face of Fortune seemed steadily set against him. A drought and famine of remarkable severity afflicted the whole extent of Eastern Africa, and produced the well-known fruits of disorganisation and political troubles among the native tribes. It also happened that a chief of importance had died, and the question of his succession was disputed by arms. In short, the two travellers pushed through far more severe impediments than they had reckoned upon, before even Kazeh was reached; and, on attempting to proceed farther, they were attacked and plundered. Speke became seriously ill, and Grant, who at that time was detached from him, with a portion of the remaining stores, could barely hold his own. Communication with Zanzibar was ex-

pected to be cut off, and matters wore for a time a very alarming aspect. However, the two friends effected a junction, and contrived to fall back on Kazeh, and to reorganise their party by obtaining a new set of porters and fresh interpreters. They then recommenced their journey in October, 1861, just one year after leaving Zanzibar, with restored health, better prospects, and lighter hearts. Thus far we had heard from them *via* Zanzibar, but not a scrap of intelligence of their subsequent fate reached even the confines of the civilised world, until the two travellers emerged at Gondakoro, on the White Nile, on February 15, 1863.

Of the two routes from Kazeh by which the northern end of Lake Nyanza may be reached, a person who was merely guided by his map, might conclude it was a matter of indifference whether a traveller should follow the eastern or the western shore of the lake. But when political causes are taken into consideration, it is found that the eastern route is wholly impracticable. It passes through the territory of a warlike and disunited people, the Masai, with whom no traveller has yet succeeded in making friends. They possess no paramount chief, whose goodwill can shield the explorer throughout an extensive country, but every tribe is independent in its own domain, and probably on ill terms with its neighbours. Thus, the Baron Von der Decken, who measured and ascended the missionaries' snow mountain, Kilimandjaro, to a height of 13,000 feet, has recently been driven back by the Masai, on attempting to enter their territory from the eastern side. The western and north-western shores of the lake are subject to very different political conditions. They are included in the territory of Uganda, and one despotic sovereign holds them under his strict control. He also maintains a fleet of war-canoes on its waters. He is, therefore, all-powerful to aid or to thwart a traveller, and it was to his court that Speke and Grant intended to proceed, in order to gain his assistance.

Thus far, say 120 miles north-west of Kazeh, the travellers had journeyed among the Wanyamesi and other uninteresting negroes, who are said to have been formerly included in a kingdom of some importance. They are now scattered in tribes and families, where each man does what is right in his own eyes, subject to no restriction beyond the self-imposed restraint of superstitious customs and the personal interference of his neighbours. The single principle they possess, that attains to the dignity of a national policy, is a tacit understanding that travelling parties should be taxed and robbed by individuals, only so far as will fall short of putting a stop to the caravan

trade altogether. It is cold comfort to acknowledge that this is an advance upon the doctrines of the Masai. Now, however, on the western shores of Lake Nyanza, Speke and Grant came upon a series of strong governments, including that of Uganda, and found their history to be of considerable interest.

Scattered among the Wanyamesi, and other neighbouring races, are found families of a superior type to the negro. They exist as a pastoral people, but in other respects they adopt the customs of the races of Africa. They bear different names in different places, but we will describe them by that which has the widest currency, namely, Wāhūmā. Speke considers them offshoots of the Gallas of Abyssinia, and of Asiatic origin. He believes they migrated in somewhat ancient times in bands from Abyssinia, and met with various fortunes. In some countries, as in Unyamesi, they were simply mingled with the natives; but in those he was about to visit they had achieved the position of a ruling caste, though quite insignificant in numbers, when compared to the negroes whom they ruled. Such was first found to be the case in Uzinli, a small country governed by a robber, the terror of Arab traders, which lies 80 miles to the west of the south end of Lake Nyanza. Speke and Grant traversed Uzinli with the greatest difficulty, and thence made their way to the capital of the hospitable Wahuma king of Karagwé, which lay 250 miles from Kazeh and 70 miles west of the lake. Uganda lies north of Karagwé, and is rarely visited by traders from Zanzibar. It was Speke's aim to make a favourable impression on the more accessible king of Karagwé, and to avail himself of his good will in obtaining a satisfactory introduction to his powerful neighbour. Rumanika, the King of Karagwé, keeps up his state with some magnificence, and has the bearing and the liberal ideas of a gentleman. His country is a fair undulating land, partly 6,000 feet above the sea, and elsewhere sloping to the lake. His cattle cover the hills in tens of thousands. His rule is strict, and his people are thriving; but as the peculiarities of Wahuma governments were more noteworthy in Uganda, we will reserve the description of them just at present.

Speke quitted Karagwé on the 1st of June, 1862, escorted by a guard sent by Rumanika, and carrying a friendly letter of introduction to M'téee, the King of Uganda.

Many are the difficulties of African travel, due to physical and other causes, that readily suggest themselves to any one, such as heat, rains, privations, and unruly attendants; but these may be overcome by any man who is gifted with a strong con-

stitution, determination, and patience. The greatest difficulty of all depends on other causes, over which no traveller, however well qualified, has more than a limited control. There is the accident of the tribes among whom he travels, being at peace or at war with each other, and that of a despot's caprice being favourable or unfavourable to his progress. Wherever active warfare is carried on, the road is almost hopelessly closed between the contending parties; wherever there is peace, the suspicion of a ruler is aroused by the arrival of a stranger, on a doubtful errand to traverse his territory. He suspects his mission to be espionage, he trembles lest enchantments should ensue, and is quite sure that covert danger of some kind or other is to be apprehended, if the traveller is allowed to move about as he pleases. Land journeys of great extent, in Africa, can only be made, either when the road is freely open to caravans, as was the case in Burton and Speke's expedition to Tanganyika, or when the goodwill of a chief has been obtained who enjoys such power and prestige that his escort, or even his name, is a sufficient passport. The latter was the good fortune of Livingstone, and such was also the happy luck of Speke, whose power of managing natives seems to be unsurpassed by any recent traveller, and unequalled save by Livingstone. It also happened that the Wahuma kings, especially the King of Uganda, had a motive in letting him pass; they desired the establishment of trading routes with the stations visited by white men. They live in considerable semi-barbaric state, and have, as we shall presently see, a more refined taste than is usually heard of in negro Africa. Their wants are in advance of the productive skill of their people, though these are raised many degrees above barbarism: for instance, to show their advance in mechanical arts, the native blacksmiths have sufficient skill to inlay iron with copper. The King of Karagwé has not unfrequently received European manufactures by way of Zanzibar, though his rascally brother of Uzinli lays an almost prohibitive black mail on whatever passes his territory. The king of a yet more northern Wahuma State than Uganda, by name Unyoro, of which we have not hitherto spoken, but which abuts on the negro tribes in the neighbourhood of Gondakoro, occasionally obtained goods that had been conveyed by whites on the Nile; but none of these ever reached M'tése, the King of Uganda, except as noteworthy presents from his neighbouring brother-sovereigns. It naturally followed that he felt an eager desire to open a commercial route in both directions, and was thrown into a ferment of joy at the news of Speke's arrival. Little did M'tése know of the



evil of uncontrolled traffic with a powerful and unscrupulous race. When Speke saw the doings of the Turkish traders at Gondakoro, and witnessed their plunder, their insolence, and their cruelty, he regretted bitterly that the word 'trade' had ever passed his lips to tempt his kind-hearted host in Uganda.

Speke's route lay through vast reedy plains parallel to the west shores of the Nyanza. He crossed deep stagnant channels every mile, and one great river, which seemed to him as full of water as the White Nile itself, flowing swift and deep between banks of dense stiff reeds, impenetrable except through certain tortuous paths. This river may therefore be reckoned as the parent stream of the Nyanza Lake; or, in other words, the river of Karagwé is the true head-water of the Nile.

Uganda occupies the whole of the north-western shoulder of the lake, whose shores are of the shape of a schoolboy's peg-top. The peg-end is directed due south, and looks on the map very like an ancient outlet, in a southern direction, into an adjacent tributary of the Tanganyika Lake. Its geographical position is  $2^{\circ} 30'$  S. lat. and  $33^{\circ} 30'$  E. long. The flat upper boundary of the lake closely coincides with the equator, and from its very centre, and also at the frontier of Uganda, the Nile issues in a stream 150 yards wide with a leap of twelve feet. Numerous other outlets of the lake (if in truth they be not independent rivers,) convergé upon the Nile at various distances, one of which does not join it till after an independent course of ninety miles from the lake. One hardly knows where else to find an example of such hydrographical conditions. When a river runs into a lake or the sea, it has always a tendency to divide itself in many channels, because it deposits mud and forms a delta; but Speke's map presents that same appearance of many channels, in connexion with an outflow of the river, which is certainly a very unusual, as it is an unintelligible condition. The lake is heavily bordered by reeds, and continues exceedingly shallow far from shore; no boats venture to cross it. Uganda is bounded by the main stream of the Nile, which Speke followed, more or less closely, the whole way from the Nyanza to Gondakoro, a distance of near  $5^{\circ}$ , say 350 miles, with the exception of one part where it makes a great and remarkable bend. At the middle of the bend the river is said to dip into the northern shoulder of the Luta Nzigé, a narrow lake of some 200 miles in length, and to reissue immediately. There is some confusion about this name, though none about the water it refers to. Luta Nzigé, which is said to mean

neither more nor less than 'dead locust,' was applied by the natives to many sheets of water, including the Nyanza itself. Speke identifies the lake of which we are now speaking by the phrase 'little Luta Nzigé.' The travellers were compelled by circumstances to cut across the chord of the above-mentioned bend, a distance of eighty miles, and to leave the Luta Nzigé unvisited; but we are exceedingly glad to hear that this single deficiency in their exploration, is in a fair way of being supplied by the zeal of an excellent traveller, Mr. Samuel Baker, to whose proceedings we shall shortly recur, and who has started from Gondakoro for that purpose. It is the more necessary that this interval should be examined, as there is an unaccountable difference of altitude of the river before and after the bend, amounting to 1,000 feet. If there be no error of observations, a vast system of rapids and waterfalls must intervene.

It aids our conception of numerical data to measure them by simple standards; those that refer to the Nile are thus to be easily disposed of. That river spans, from south to north, very nearly one fifth of the entire meridional arc, from pole to pole; and its general course is so strictly to the north, that its source in the river of Karagwé is due south of Alexandria. Khartûm is the exact half way between the sea and the exit of the Nile from the Nyanza, which lies almost exactly under the equator.

Having thus far anticipated the narrative of Speke's personal adventures by alluding to some of the main features of the country, we will proceed to fill in the picture by further details. Karagwé occupies the eastern slope of a plateau 6,000 feet above the sea. Conical hills, of which M'fumbiro is the highest and most central, are scattered about the plain, but there are no mountain giants and no continuous range. Westward of the plateau the watershed is into a small lake called the Rusizi, lying between the parallels of  $1^{\circ}$  and  $2^{\circ}$  and in about the  $30^{\circ}$  E. long. An affluent of Lake Tanganyika proceeds due southwards from this lake, consequently the amphitheatre of mountains that has been pictured in some maps round the northern end of the Tanganyika must be removed, or be so far cut away as to admit of the river's entry. An east and west distance of 150 miles separates the Rusizi from the Nyanza. The next tribute to geographical science, collected by Speke from native information, is that the Tanganyika has a large outlet at its southern extremity, which feeds the Niassa of Livingstone, and therefore reaches the sea by way of the Shiré and the Zambesi. This new fact, if fact it be, ranks as

a signal triumph to common sense, in the face of the former observations of Burton and Speke, who navigated some distance down the Tanganyika, but never were within 150 miles of its supposed end. They insisted, upon native evidence, that a river ran *into* it at that place, not out of it. Consequently, the Tanganyika, though a fresh-water lake, was described as resembling the Dead Sea, a sheet of water without any outlet whatever that gets rid of the water poured into it by means of evaporation only. It was objected, on their arrival in England, that two facts were also stated, irreconcilable with such an hypothesis; namely, that while, on the one hand, the periodical rains fell heavily and continuously during half the year, when no evaporation took place, so, on the other hand, there was no variation in the level of the lake, as ascertained at the wharves of the fishermen. It was wholly impossible that a half-yearly supply and loss of water should be accompanied by an unvarying level. The statement now brought back by Speke is in accordance with physical science, as well as with the maps of Cooley and of the missionaries.

We have thus far arrived at the fact, that the high table-land, 120 miles across, of which M'fumbiro is the centre, is drained on the east by the tributaries of the Nyanza, and therefore of the Nile, and on the south-south-west by those of the Tanganyika, and therefore of the Zambesi. There is also strong reason to believe, from the information brought by Speke, as well as from the appearance of the map and the conclusions of previous African geographers, that the sources of the Congo are to be found there also. Hence we may conclude that from this circumscribed district the waters drain into the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean, and the Atlantic, and that the M'fumbiro plateau is the key-stone, the *omphelos*, of African geography. We consider this fact, if fact it be, as the greatest discovery made by Speke and Grant.\*

---

\* It deserves observation that De Barros, one of the best informed of the Portuguese geographers, whose work was published in 1591, and is quoted by Dr. Beke in his 'Essay on the Sources of the Nile, (p. 40.), speaks of a great lake in the interior as sending forth three rivers, namely, the Tacuy or Nile, the Zaire or Congo, and the Zambesi or Cuama. He says, 'The Nile truly has its origin in this first lake, which is in 12° S. latitude, and it runs 400 miles due north, and enters another very large lake, which is called by the natives a sea, because it is 220 miles in extent, and it lies under the equator.' The people on this lake are described as more civilised than the people of Congo. Though not strictly accurate, this ancient statement is an approach to what has now been ascertained to be the truth.

The theory of Sir Roderick Murchison, that the interior of Africa is an elevated watery plateau, whence rivers escape by bursting, through a circumscribing mountainous boundary, must now be received with *some* limitation. It was literally true in the case of the Zambesi, but facts are still wanting to test its strict applicability to the Congo; and, as to the Nile, the following remarks were made by Sir Roderick in his Anniversary Address to the Royal Geographical Society:—

‘Modern discovery has indeed proved the truth of the hypothesis, which I ventured to suggest to you eleven years ago, that the true centre of Africa is a great elevated watery basin, often abounding in rich lands, its large lakes being fed by numerous streams from adjacent ridges, and its waters escaping to the sea by fissures and depressions in the higher surrounding lands. It was at our anniversary of 1852, when many *data* that have since been accumulated were unknown to us, that, in my comparative view of Africa in primeval and modern times, I ventured to suggest that the interior of Africa would be found to be such an unequally elevated basin, occupied now, as it was in ancient geological periods, by fresh-water lakes, the outflow of which would be to the east and to the west, through fissures in subtending ranges of higher mountains near the coast. While this theory was clearly verified in Southern Africa by Livingstone in the escape of the Zambesi, as narrated by himself, and is well known to be true in the case of the Niger, so does it apply to the Nile, in as far as the great central lake, Victoria Nyanza, occupies a lofty plateau of 3,500 feet above the sea. In this example, as the waters flow from a southern watershed, and cannot escape to the east or the west, there being no great transversal valleys in the flanking higher grounds, they necessarily issue from the northern end of the Lake Victoria Nyanza, and, forming the White Nile, take advantage of a succession of depressions, through which they flow and cascade.’

We, therefore, see that the watery plateau which was described as extending to the Niger, in western longitudes, is terminated by the equator in the eastern portion of Africa.

We learn, in addition, that the exceptional character of the Nile is shared in a very much more remarkable degree by the Tanganyika, Niassa, and Shiré valleys. The Tanganyika occupies a crevasse of some 300 miles in length, comparable in its narrowness and abruptness to the Valley of the Dead Sea. In exactly a similar way, the Niassa and the Shiré occupy a continuous north and south chasm, that has already been traced by Livingstone to a distance of 450 miles. Now that we hear of a connexion existing between the Tanganyika and Niassa, we may reasonably suppose that its channel runs through a similar fissure. The length of the entire series, from the Rusizi to the Zambesi, is nearly 1,400 miles in a direct line.

Bearing these extraordinary facts in mind, the great feature of Eastern Africa consists in a more or less marked groove, occupied by water-channels. It runs right through the continent from north to south, beginning at Alexandria and ending where the land narrows into the promontory that terminates with the Cape Colonies. It cleaves the eastern shoulder of Africa from the rest of the continent, much as Arabia is cleft from Africa by the long and narrow Red Sea. So, again, to adduce another example from a neighbouring country, the deep and continuous Valley of the Jordan, Dead Sea, Wady Araba, and the Gulf of Akaba, is formed by an abrupt fissure possessing no less than three watersheds,—that of the sources of the Jordan in the north, and those of the Wady Araba, whence the drainage is to the Dead Sea on the one hand, and to the Gulf of Akaba on the other. It is remarkable that our globe presents so close a repetition of the same peculiar fissures in several neighbouring places, and it strongly tempts us to refer their production to the same class of physical agencies.

Another important acquisition in geography, for which we are indebted to this and the previous expedition, consists in a greatly improved knowledge of the water-supply of Central Africa. It is undeniable that, owing to the great majority of travels, in recent years, having been confined to the Sahara, the Karoos, and the Kaliharri, an impression has forced itself on the popular mind that the whole interior of Africa is arid. But it is an error to suppose that this opinion was current among educated geographers; their fault lay in the opposite direction. The only approach, in recent times, to a belief in the aridity of any part of Africa, which subsequent facts disproved, lay in the question of the northern boundary of the Kaliharri Desert. It was a surprise to geographers when Livingstone showed them that it was *abruptly* bounded by a swampy land, full of large rivers; but in reference to the general question of the moisture or drought of equatorial Africa, the exceeding humidity of its coasts has unduly influenced opinion, as to the character of its more distant interior.

To take a single example, we will quote a few lines from a masterly sketch of African geography in the first volume of Bruce's 'Travels,' which appeared at the beginning of this century. It was written by his editor, Dr. Murray, and will be found in the appendix on the Galla races—those people from whom Speke theoretically derives the Wahumas:—

'The scanty knowledge we possess of the eastern and western shores of Africa, in the region of the Line, would lead us to suppose that the central country is mountainous, intersected with deep

and extensive valleys and large streams, whose banks have all the wild luxuriance of warm rainy climates. All the kingdoms that lie round the Gulf of Guinea are well watered, and, consequently, fertile in a high degree. South of these, the countries of Loando, Congo, Ngolo, and Benguela, where the Portuguese have settled, merit a similar character, which undoubtedly may be extended across the interior to the countries of Mozambico, Querimba, and Zanzibar, on the opposite eastern shore. . . . All the interior of Africa between the tropics must be full of rivers, woods, and ravines, on account of the rains which inundate it during the winter season. Accordingly, we observe abundance of streams in these latitudes, which enter the ocean on either side.'

The error of more recent geographers has lain in the same direction. Thus, in Keith Johnston's 'Physical Atlas,' the chart of the distribution of rain ascribes an amount of precipitation in equatorial Africa, little inferior to that observed in similar latitudes elsewhere in the world. The humidity of the coasts of Africa corroborated this view, and the outpour of water from its interior did not disprove it. The river drainage of Africa was known to be large, while our imperfect knowledge of the river mouths along its coasts, made it probable that the outpour was still greater than had actually been ascertained. Africa used to be described as a land in which we knew of the existence of vast rivers, but were ignorant of their embouchures. The Niger of a generation back, the Zambesi, the Limpopo, and the great river of Du Chaillu, are all instances where the streams were known by exaggerated reports, but their mouths, where nautical surveyors might gauge the water they pour into the sea, were undiscovered.

The hydrology of Eastern Africa is now pretty well understood; it depends upon well-marked geographical features. A narrow coast-line is bounded by the rampart-like edge of a high plateau: the rain-bearing monsoons blow parallel to this ridge, and not across it; consequently there are heavy rains on the coast-line, and a comparative drought to a considerable space beyond. On passing about a quarter of the distance across Africa, and on arriving at the meridian of the lakes, rain again begins to fall freely, but its amount, as measured by Grant's rain-gauge, bears no comparison to the deluge that descends in similar parallels, either on the great oceans, or on the islands that lie within them, elsewhere in the world.

Whatever water the rivers of a country may pour year by year into the sea, must have been derived from it, on the average, within the same periods. Now it is clear, from geographical considerations, that Africa is unfavourably disposed to receiving rain-bearing currents from the ocean. The existence of the

Sahara to the north, and the Kaliharri Desert to the south, makes it impossible that vapour supplies should reach the interior in a straight line from the sea in either of those directions. Again, we have already said that the monsoons blow parallel to the east coast, and we should add, that the trade winds blow parallel to the west coast; consequently, the vapour that reaches the interior must be derived from limited directions, and can only be conveyed by the comparatively insignificant channel of upper atmospheric currents. We consequently find that the vegetation of Central Equatorial Africa is, on the whole, not so moist and steaming as that of its coasts, but that it is largely characterised by open plains and scraggy mimosa trees; and though the flatness of large portions of its surface admits of the ready formation of great lakes and reedy plains, there is an absence of that vast amount of suspended vapour which would ensue from African temperatures, if the air were saturated with moisture. The chief cause of the rise of the White Nile must not be looked for in the swelling of the Nyanza Lake. The rain-fall was found to be too continuous throughout the year to make any very marked alteration of its level; but south of the latitude of Gondakoro, the division of the rainy and dry season begins to be sharply defined. We should therefore mainly ascribe the rise of the White Nile to the rain-fall north of about 3° N. lat.

We will now turn from considerations of physical geography to the history and character of the races among whom Speke and Grant have been so long familiar. It seems clear to us that in no part of Africa do the negroes present so few points of interest, as in the country which stretches between the lakes Tanganyika and Nyanza and the eastern coast. But on arriving at the three Wahuma kingdoms, which enclose the western and north-western shores of the latter lake, a remarkable state of social and political life arrests the attention. Two at least of these Wahuma kingdoms have the advantage of being ruled with a firm hand, and, as we have already stated, the three are governed by a stranger dynasty, of a higher race than the people who compose the bulk of their respective nations. This is no exceptional occurrence in Africa: the great kingdoms of North African negroland which now, or formerly, stretch in a succession of blocks below the Sahara, from the Niger to the Nile, have been for the most part founded by alien races. It is hard to overrate the value of such a political condition to a negro population, who are servile, susceptible, and little able to rule themselves. The negro is plastic under the influence of a strong, if it be a sympathetic, govern-

ment, to an extent of which our northern experiences can afford no instance. The recent growth of national dignity among the Italians is a feeble parallel to what may be effected, in the same time, by the conversion of a barbarian chief to the Mahometan creed. The impressionable character of the negroes is such as may be seen in a school of European boys, which is immediately infected by bad example and negligent discipline, and almost as rapidly raised in moral tone by the influence of a capable master. We Anglo-Saxons stand too far from the negroes, socially, morally, and intellectually, to be able to influence them like the Arabs, the Tawareks, or these Wahumas.

The eagerness of the African to be led, and his incapacity to lead, is such that any able and energetic man, who can hold his own for a few years, appears to have a good chance of founding a kingdom and originating new customs and names. The political state of the African negroland seeths with continual agitation. The Niger countries have been known to us little more than forty years, yet that short space of time has witnessed the introduction of an entirely new race, the Fellatahs, and the construction of an enormous aggregate of Fellatah kingdoms, not only on the foundation of previously existing governments, but also by the annexation of barbarian races. So in South Africa, the Kaffir tribes of the earlier travellers, have changed their names; they and their Hottentot, Negro, and Negroid neighbours dwell within largely modified frontiers; half-caste breeds of the Hottentots have flourished and become absorbed, while another somewhat adulterated Hottentot race, the Namaquas, are become the most powerful of any native race. The remainder of Africa is known to us so lately, that we have nothing but recent tradition and circumstantial evidence to guide us; these, however, suffice to confirm our assertion. The negroes are continually grouping themselves in fresh combinations, to an extent that may remind us of a pack of cards, variously dealt over and over again into different hands. The story of the Wahuma nations is quaint and characteristic; we will describe that of Uganda.

Many generations ago, a great kingdom of negroes, ruled by Wahuma chiefs, was established in the country now divided among Karagwé, Uganda, and Unyoro. That portion which bordered the lake, and is now called Uganda, was considered as the garden of the whole, and the agriculturists who tilled it, were treated as slaves. Then a man named Kiméra, himself a Wahuma, who was also a great hunter, happened to frequent for his sport, the Nile near its outflow from the Nyanza. The negro natives flocked to him in crowds, to share the game



he killed, and he became so popular that they ended by making him their king. They said their own sovereign lived far off and was of no use to them. If any one sent him a cow as a tributary present, the way to his palace was so long that the cow had time to have a calf on the road, and the calf had time to grow into a cow and to have a calf of its own. They were therefore determined to establish a separate kingdom. Kiméra became a powerful and magnificent king, and formed the Kingdom of Uganda. He built himself a vast enclosure of large huts, as a palace; he collected an enormous harem to fill them. He made highways across the country, built boats for war purposes on the lake, organised an army, legislated on ceremonies, behaviour, and dress, and superintended *hygiène* so closely, that no house could be built in his country without its necessary appendages for cleanliness. In short, he was a model king, and established an order of things which has continued to the present day, through seven generations of successors, with little change. He was embalmed when he died, his memory is venerated, and his hunting outfit, the dog and the spear, continue to be the armorial insignia of Uganda.

Kiméra left at his death an enormous progeny, to whom his people behaved as ruthlessly as if they had been disciples of Mr. Carlyle, or as a hive of some imaginary species of bees might be supposed to treat their too numerous royal grubs. We do not learn what became of the girls, but the boys were sumptuously housed and fed, and when they grew up were royally wived; but they were strictly watched and kept asunder, lest they should intrigue. The most promising youth of the lot was elected king; the two *proxime accesserunt* were set aside as a reserve in case of accident, and then the people burnt to death, without compunction, every one of the remaining princes. The people have certainly been well ruled under this strict system of artificial selection, and the three Wahuma kings are every one of them more than six feet high.

Uganda is described as a most surprising country, in the order, neatness, civility, and politeness of its inhabitants. It would be a pattern even for Zanzibar; but M'tése's reign is a reign of terror. It is an established custom that there should be one execution daily. The ceremonies and rules of precedence of the Court of Uganda, as in that of the other Wahuma courts, are minutely defined, and are exacted under penalty of death. The first among the dignitaries of State is the lady who had the good fortune to have acted as monthly nurse to the sovereign's mother. After this Mrs. Gamp, follow the Queen's sister and the King's barber. Then come governors of provinces and

naval and military commanders; then the executioners (who are busy men in Uganda), and the superintendents of tombs; lastly, the cook. In a lower grade are juvenile pages to look after the women, and to run upon errands: they are killed if they dare to walk. In addition to these is an effective band of musicians, who drum, rattle gourds with dry peas inside them, play flutes, clarionettes, wooden harmoniums, and harps, besides others who sing and whistle on their fingers. Every person of distinction must constantly attend on his sovereign, or his estates are liable to be utterly confiscated. He must be decorously dressed in a sort of toga, made from the pounded bark of the fig-tree, for he is fined heavily or killed outright if he exhibits even a patch of bare leg. What a blessing trousers would be to them! These bark cloaks are beautifully made, and look like the best corduroy; they are worn over robes of small antelope skins sewn together with the utmost furrier's art. Every courtier's language must be elegant, and his deportment modelled upon established custom. Even the King is not free; Wahuma taste exacts that whenever he walks he should imitate the gait of a vigilant lion, by ramping with his legs and turning from side to side. When he accepts a present from a man, or orders a man a whipping, the favoured individual must return thanks for the condescending attention, by floundering flat on the ground and whining like a happy dog. Levees are held on most days in the palace, which is a vast enclosure full of life. It occupies the brow of a hill, and consists of gigantic grass huts, beautifully thatched. The ground is strewn with mats and with rushes in patterns, and is kept with scrupulous care. Half-gorged vultures wheel over it, looking out for victims hurried aside to execution. The three or four thousand wives of the King inhabit the huts and quizzed Speke's party. There is plenty to do at these levees, both in real work and in ceremony. Orders are given, punishments adjudged, presents are received. Military commanders bring in the cattle and plunder they have taken; artisans bring their *chefs d'œuvre*; hunters produce rare animals, dead and alive, Kiméra, the first king, having established a menagerie. Pages are running about, literally for their lives, and the band of drummers and pea-gourd rattlers, and artistes whistling on their fingers, with the other accompaniments, never ceases to play. The King has, however, some peace. He sets aside three days a month to attend to his religious ceremonies. He possesses a collection of magic horns, which he arranges and contemplates, and thereby communicates with a spirit who lives deep in the waters of the Nyanza. He also indulges in the interpretation of dreams. At other times he makes pilgrimages,

dragging his wives after him; on which occasions no common man dare look at the royal procession. If any peeping Tom be seen, the inevitable pages hunt him down and rob him of everything. Occasionally the King spends a fortnight yachting on the lake, and Speke was his companion on one of these occasions. M'tése, the King, is a young man of twenty-five, who dresses scrupulously well, and uses a pocket-handkerchief. He is a keen sportsman, and became a capital shot at flying game, under Speke's tuition. He told Speke that Uganda was his garden, and that no one might say nay to him. Grant, we may mention, had been ill, and remained five months at Karagwé, while his colleague had gone forwards to feel the way.

Speke established his position at the Court of Uganda by judicious self-assertion and happy audacity. He would not flounder on his belly, nor whine like a happy dog. He would not even consent to stand in the sun awaiting the King's leisure at the first interview, but insisted on sitting in his own chair with an umbrella over his head. The courtiers must have expected the heavens to fall upon such a man, but they did not; and, in the end, M'tése treated him like a brother, and the two were always together. Savage despots have to be managed like wild beasts. If the traveller is too compliant, he is oppressed, thwarted, and ruined; if he is too audacious, the autocrat becomes furious, and the traveller is murdered, like Vogel in Wadai.

Though Speke was treated with the utmost friendliness at Uganda, living entirely at the King's expense, his movements were narrowly constrained, and he never seems to have left the immediate neighbourhood of the palace, except on the one occasion when he was yachting with M'tése, who would not allow him to explore the lake more thoroughly. He was detained month after month, according to the usual fate of African travellers, and finally effected his departure with difficulty. Other reported facts on the geography of the land had now transpired. The southern end of the Lake Luta Nzigé was 100 or 150 miles due west of the northern end of the Nyanza, and therefore on the equator; and another small lake, the Baringo, was described due east of the Nyanza, and so far connected with it that the canoes of the Uganda people sailed there for salt. Its outlet was said to be by the Asua, a small river which joins the Nile above Gondakoro, near the farthest point reached by Miani. It would appear from the map, that if Kenia and Kilimandjaro send any of their drainage waters to the White Nile, it must be by way of the Baringo. Hence,

whatever snow-water may be contributed to the White Nile must be poured into it through the Asua River.

After Speke and Grant had left the capital of Uganda, they travelled with an escort; Speke diverged directly to the Nile, which he struck fifty miles from the lake. Speke then ascended the river, and traced it to its exit from the Nyanza, and afterwards returned down its stream in canoes. We pass over the particulars of his journey, though it was, personally, eventful to him. His boats were unexpectedly attacked, while he was still in Uganda, and he forced his way through considerable dangers. Finally, he reached the capital of Unyoro, the third and last of the great Wahuma kingdoms.

His reception by the King was unfriendly. The Unyoro people are sullen, cowardly, and disobliging, and their habits afford a disagreeable contrast to the sprightly ways and natty dress of their neighbours in Uganda, whom Speke compares to the French. He and Grant spent many dreary months at Unyoro, in lat.  $1^{\circ} 40' N.$ , before they were allowed to proceed. The King would never permit them even to enter his palace: he was always at his witchcrafts. They were first threatened by the Unyoro people and then by their Uganda escort, who endeavoured to take them back. Half of their porters deserted them. It would weary the reader to follow the travellers' narrative of their truly African miseries in this inhospitable land. They were felt the more acutely because the bourne of their journey was close at hand, and many things denoted the neighbourhood of the races and localities known to travellers from the north. Negroes were seen in Unyoro, speaking an entirely new class of languages, which Speke's own interpreters could make nothing of. One single language in modified dialects, had carried the travellers the whole way from Zanzibar to Unyoro; now they were on the frontier of the northern tongues. These new races were barbarians, absolutely naked in their own land, and wearing a mere scrap of clothing in Unyoro, out of deference to Wahuma habits. Rumours reached the travellers of white traders at no great distance from them, on the river, and they chafed at their detention. They sent forward the chief of their Zanzibar men, Bombay by name, who has already figured in Burton's and Speke's writings. He returned firing his gun, frantic with delight, and dressed in new clothes. He said he had been to the Turks, who were encamped eight marches south of Gondakoro. At length, after daily anxieties and heart-sickness, a partial permission came for their departure, and the explorers made a joyful escape. It was impossible for them to follow the

river, for a brother of the King of Unyoro occupied its banks, and was at war with him; they took a direct line across country, to Gondakoro, which led them along the chord of that bend of the Nile, to which we have already alluded. When they again struck the river, they found themselves in a Turkish camp, at 3° 10' N. lat. It was an ivory station, made by men in the employment of Debono, and established a short distance south of the farthest point reached by Miani. They were rapturously received, and Speke's men abandoned care and got drunk for a week. The Turks were preparing to start for Gondakoro, with the ivory they had bartered, and Speke waited till they were ready, for he was absolutely unable to get on without assistance. The Bari people among whom they were residing, are so disunited, that no village possesses a body of porters sufficient in number to travel securely by themselves; nor could they be spared to go, for, if they attempted to do so, the comparative weakness of the villagers who staid at home would invite the attack of their neighbours. The Turks moved in a great caravan; they wanted some 2,000 porters, so they exacted a certain quota from every village, by which means they got their men, and the balance of power among the natives was not disturbed. In this despotic, effective way, Speke was enabled to reach Gondakoro. He was, however, thoroughly shocked by the recklessness with which stolen cattle and plundered ivory were bought, and with the exactions and terrorism that are made to administer to the demands of the Turkish ivory trade. The Arab traders of Uniamesi were perfect gentlemen compared to these Turks, whose conduct was inhuman to the last degree. He thoroughly confirms what has been so often repeated of late by various travellers to Gondakoro.

The discovery of this great river springing from two lakes, does certainly confirm the belief that the ancient knowledge of the Nile was more advanced than that of recent times; but the want of circumstantial precision with which the ancient accounts are conveyed, left an impression adverse to their truth. They stride in one great leap from Khartûm to the sources, without any description of the intervening land, unless we except Strabo's, which is as follows, if we understand it aright. After clearly describing all the Nile, down to the Athâra and Blue River, he says, 'But the Astapus is said to be another river which issues out of some lakes in the South, and this river forms nearly the whole of the Nile; it flows in a straight line, and is filled by the summer rains.' When we speak of geographical discovery, we rarely, if ever, mean the first sight of what no human eye had previously seen, but the visit of men

who could observe geographically, and describe what they saw, so as to leave no obscurity as to their meaning. These conditions had never previously been satisfied as regards the Nile; for geographers, working with the fairest intentions upon the same data, came to diverse conclusions, and no map made by any one of them bore other than a rude and childish resemblance to what is now ascertained to be the truth.

The first person Speke saw when he reached Gondakoro was his old friend Baker, who had just arrived there, bound on a self-planned journey of exploration and of relief to Speke. The interview, to use Speke's own words, intoxicated them both with joy. Baker gave him his return boats, stored with corn, and supplied him with every delicacy he could think of, and thus the journey ended. Mr. Consul Petherick, who had been furnished with 1,000*l.*, the proceeds of a private subscription to bear relief to Speke, and who had undertaken to arrive at Gondakoro a year previously, had wholly failed in his mission. Strangely enough, he too arrived at Gondakoro, previous to Speke's departure from that place, but not in a condition to render that succour which Baker had so happily and gratuitously afforded.

Gondakoro does not seem to be quite such a desert as Petherick had represented, where Speke must necessarily have starved had no expedition been directed to meet him. On the contrary, a polished Circassian Turk, Koorschid Pasha, had been governor of the place for fourteen months: he instantly gave the travellers a dinner of a fat turkey, concluded with claret and cigars.

Thus closes the tale of a journey that involved a *walk* of 1,300 miles through the equatorial regions of Africa, and has solved almost the only remaining geographical problem of importance. It has been the Matterhorn of the Geographical Society, the grandest feat and the longest delayed. If Speke himself, or Baker, would cross from the Luta Nzigé to the Atlantic, and if some Gregory or Stuart would traverse Western Australia, the great secret chambers of the habitable earth would all be unlocked.

ART. VIII.—1. *Les Écossais en France, les Français en Écosse.*

Par FRANCISQUE-MICHEL. 2 vols. 8vo. Londres: 1862.

2. *Papiers d'État relatifs à l'Histoire de l'Écosse au 16<sup>m</sup> Siècle; tirés des Bibliothèques et des Archives de France, et publiés pour le Bannatyne Club d'Édimbourg.* 3 vols. 4to. Paris.

3. *Papers relative to the Royal Guard of Scottish Archers in France.* (From Original Documents.) Printed at Edinburgh for the Maitland Club. 1 vol. 4to. 1835.

IN the midst of international questions of every shape and shade, and when the value of every conceivable form of international relation is daily submitted to the test of fresh experience, it is interesting to turn to the history of an alliance, the direct effects of which have ceased for three centuries to be appreciable to politicians, but which is still so important in the eyes of men of learning and ability as to entitle it to a literature of its own. The alliance of France and Scotland was, indeed, a memorable friendship, standing out from all merely political arrangements not only by intimacy and warmth whilst it endured, but by the lasting effects which it left behind it. These M. Francisque-Michel has traced,—in the public history, and still more in the private and domestic annals of France. In Scotland they meet us at every turn,—in the institutions, habits, and speech of the people, from the organisation of the Court of Session, the terminology of the law, and the constitution of the Presbyterian Church, to the baking of ‘kickshaws’ (quelquechoses) and ‘petticoat-tails’ (petits-gâteaux), and the opening of an oyster.\* The high-roofed gable and the pepper-box turret of the French chateau gave to Scotland a style of architecture which became domestic amongst us in the sixteenth century, and which has been revived in our own days with great propriety and taste. We claim for the popular cookery of Scotland, distinguished by an enlightened use of vegetables and of broths, a marked superiority over the barbarous culinary preparations of South Britain; but it must be confessed that we owe that superiority to the lessons of our French allies. And, as we write, we are informed that in more than one Scottish village lingers the tradition of a French tambour-stitch, which was probably imported when the newest fashions came from the Court of Blois or Fontainebleau.

---

\* In Scotland, as in France, oysters are opened with the hollow side undermost, so as to retain the juice—a process which is too often reversed in England.

M. Michel says that a sense of the disproportion between the small space accorded to the Scottish alliance in the ordinary histories of France, and the magnitude of the part which it really played in the history of his country, was one of his motives for undertaking the work to which he has devoted so considerable a portion of his life. However the matter may have stood when M. Michel commenced his labours, five and twenty years ago, our countrymen will be extremely unreasonable if they are not more than satisfied with the *amende honorable* which has now been made to them. Of the class of writers—archæologists and compilers, rather than historians—by whom the task of reviving this curious and interesting page in the history of the two countries has been accomplished, M. Michel has been the most industrious, and he is consequently the most exhaustive. In the good work of restoring, as it were, to each other, two old school-fellows and comrades in arms, whom the changes and chances of life had drifted asunder, he holds, and probably will continue to hold, the first place. He is so far from a faultless writer, that,—taking into account that he is a Frenchman, and remembering the precision with which Frenchmen distribute their matter, and the clearness, sharpness, and brevity with which they write,—it is almost incredible that he should have produced so disorderly and dull a book. But the merits of M. Michel's performance altogether outweigh its defects; and, of the former, one of the greatest consists in the extent to which it has rectified and widened our conception of the subject of which it treats.

Hitherto this alliance between the most polished court of continental Europe and our ruder forefathers has been viewed chiefly in relation to two or three well-known historical events; for to say the truth the league of Scotland and France grew up under the shadow of England, and was strengthened by common hatred or common fear. In the popular conception of it, in France more especially, these passions centre in the single person of Mary Stuart. Everybody knows the ties which bound the beautiful and unhappy Queen to France,—that her mother was a Frenchwoman—that France was the land in which her own happy girlhood was spent—that for a brief period she sat upon the French throne (France and Scotland being then united by what would now be called a personal union)—that when she ultimately returned to her paternal kingdom she was accompanied by French attendants, and continued to be surrounded by them during her whole life, and that up to the last she herself always both spoke and wrote by preference what was indeed



her mother's tongue. So constantly are these facts present to the minds of Frenchmen, that they regard her less in the light of a beautiful exotic that flourished for a time in the rich soil of France, than as the fair and fragile emblem of their country transplanted, by an adverse destiny, to arid and sunless Scotland. But the rough unkindness of Scotland is forgotten, and the lily is seen only as crushed and broken at last by the jealousy and bigotry of England. M. Mignet has with entire justice and incomparable skill combated the prepossessions of his countrymen; but no Frenchman can forget that on the scaffold at Fotheringhay Mary Stuart reminded her executioners that it was on the Queen Dowager of France that they were about to lay their sacrilegious hands.

What has been said of the powerful and indelible character of the influences of ballad poetry, might be said with equal truth of the sympathies and antipathies which arise from occurrences that appeal very strongly to the national imagination. Scottish auxiliaries fought by the side of Joan of Arc, under the banner which, according to M. Michel, a Scotchman had painted; and Scotchmen stood around as sympathising spectators of her last sufferings at Rouen. In like manner Scotland shared the insults offered to France in the person of Mary Stuart. It is quite surprising to how great an extent these facts, and the many pathetic incidents with which they are connected, dwelt upon as they are in early youth, still colour the feelings with which Frenchmen in general regard the two divisions of this island.

But the marriage of Mary Stuart, and the occurrences which arose out of it, down to the latest generation of her male heirs, are not the only links which, even in the popular imagination, bind Scotland to France. Many other royal marriages which preceded it are for the most part forgotten — even that of the fair and tender Madeleine de Valois. But the institution of the Scottish Guard, for example, is popularly remembered; and Quentin Durward has as many readers in France as in Scotland. Then, by a more limited class of persons, the Scottish colleges, and the numbers of Scotchmen who held learned appointments in the Universities of France, are called to mind; and the intellectual relation between the two countries which extended down to a very recent period, if it does not still exist\*, is supposed to be the source at once of their national sympathies and of their political ties.

---

\* Whilst M. Victor Cousin lives, — the pupil of Royer-Collard, the friend of Hamilton, and the eloquent expositor of the Scottish school of philosophy, — we may surely hold the chain to be unbroken.

On all of these subjects the researches of M. Michel have thrown a flood of light. The general information which most persons possessed has been enriched by details, till the skeleton has become a portly figure once more. We see how each public transaction drew after it a mass of private occurrences and arrangements, not very important separately, but extremely powerful in the aggregate, as fostering the relation between the two countries. Mary of Guise, for example, no sooner finds herself in interesting circumstances than she writes to her mother to send her a physician and an apothecary — the Medical School of Edinburgh not having then, it would seem, attained to the eminence which it has long enjoyed. A decent portrait, however, could be painted in Edinburgh even in those days; for the old Duchesse, in thanking her daughter for one of the King which she had sent her, says, in the true spirit of a Frenchwoman, ‘*Je l’ay trouvé sy beau en sa peinture, que sy vous savyés combien je l’ayme, je pense vous en seriés jalouse.*’ (Vol. i. p. 431.) Though Mr. Innes informs us that ‘the *hortus olerum* was an appendage of our better dwellings from the earliest records, and that some kinds of “kail” have been used in Scotland by all classes, as far back as we have any knowledge of,’ we learn from another passage in M. Michel’s book, that Mary of Guise caused fruits and vegetables to be sent her from France, ‘*sans doute parce qu’elle n’en trouvait pas d’aussi bons dans son royaume.*’ The letter from the Vicomte de Longueville, in which he gives an account of the manner in which he discharged his commission, and of the contents of the various barrels, is quoted by M. Michel. The articles sent consisted of medlars, white peas, green peas, and pears. Of one kind of fruit, the name of which cannot be deciphered, he says he has been able to procure only about a hundred, in consequence of the disease which had attacked it everywhere that year; but he had caused the barrel to be filled up with pears, of which the Queen might procure more if she liked them. (P. 455.) Mary of Lorraine had her shoes sent her from Paris—as a French lady might very well be pardoned for doing still, notwithstanding the numbers of French shoemakers whom M. Michel found in Edinburgh—and we have Marie Courcelles’s letter to the valet de chambre, Baltasar, who seems to have been then in Paris, ordering them both for her mistress and herself.

These, and hundreds of similar facts which the industry of M. Michel has collected, give a life and colour to the well-known incidents of the connexion between France and Scotland in the sixteenth century, which they never possessed before. They

bring them nearer to us, render them more intelligible, and whilst they remove them from the sphere of tradition to that of well-authenticated history, they add to, in place of diminishing, their interest. On the other hand, however, they do not in the slightest degree account for, or even convey to us a conception of, the extent and importance of this connexion, as an international relation, not only during the sixteenth century, when it reached its culminating point, but for two centuries at least previously, and even for the whole of the first century after the Reformation. It is in supplying this information from other sources that the great value of the work before us, as compared with others not less interesting, really consists. As it is now presented to us, we see that the peculiar and very intimate relation which so long subsisted between the two countries did not arise from a few royal marriages, or even from the occasional aid which the nations afforded to each other against a common enemy. Royalty, no doubt, counted for more in the sixteenth than in the nineteenth century. Still the royal marriages of those days do not seem to have differed very widely in their political or social effects from those which in our day have been contracted between our own royal family and the Protestant Houses of Germany, and which quite recently have been formed with the Houses of Prussia and Denmark. No very marked difference has occurred in our relations with these countries in consequence of those events, and none such would have occurred between France and Scotland from that cause alone.

M. Michel finds traces of bands of Scottish mercenaries in France as early as the twelfth century; and from the appendix to his second volume (p. 528.) it appears that so late as 1642, there were enlisted for the service of Louis XIII. no less than 9,600 Scotchmen. But it was not to France alone that Scotland's soldiers of fortune went; nor were the Scotch the only people whose surplus manhood was drafted off to foreign wars. The same for ages has been the case with the Swiss; and as regards the Scotch, when their services were no longer required in France, they swarmed over into Italy and Spain. M. Michel asserts that at a very early period their wandering propensities had carried them in great numbers into Germany; and it is well known, at any rate, that they were extensively engaged in the 'Thirty years' war, on both sides. In Sweden, to this day, names so slightly altered as to leave no doubt of their Scottish origin are quite common. Along the southern shores of the Baltic, Von Douglasses and Von Gordons are to be met with, whose Scottish pedigrees are probably

kept with all the pride of those noble families. There is a quarter of the city of Danzig still called *Schottland*, in memory of a colony of Scotch weavers who settled there in the fourteenth century. From such works as the 'Diary of General Patrick Gordon,'\* we learn that at a later period vast numbers of Scotchmen flocked to the shores of the Baltic and the banks of the Vistula for trading purposes, often in the humble capacity of pedlars; and there is, perhaps, no continental blood more largely impregnated with our own than that which is again poured out at this day in Poland in the genuine spirit of martyrs for national freedom.

But to none of these countries did Scotland ever stand in a relation in any degree resembling that in which for three or four centuries she stood to France. Many Scotchmen, it is true, went to all of them who never returned, and whose descendants, it is said, still cherish the memory of their origin. But for all practical purposes these individuals ceased to be Scotchmen altogether, and their continued existence and prosperity, and even their frequent reception into the ranks of the nobility in the countries in which they settled, produced no more effect on their native land than if they had been shipwrecked in their first voyage, or had fallen on their first battle-field. Scotland borrowed nothing from Poland, and very little from Germany; and into the lands of their adoption the emigrants to these countries carried nothing that was Scotch. But such was very far from being the case with those who went to France, or even with those who permanently settled in that country. Their connexion with Scotland continued, and the whole institutions of Scotland, political, legal, and even ecclesiastical, were modified by French influences. Nor is this result at all surprising when the facts are fairly before us. The constant and uninterrupted intercourse between the two countries to which M. Michel's pages bear witness, is surprising even in this railway generation. Over and over again he adduces a flood of testimony in support of this assertion. Speaking of the period of the regency of Mary of Guise, above all, he says that 'if one were to register the names of all the persons of note who passed from France into Scotland, or who took the opposite route, one would arrive at the conclusion that never did a

---

\* Since we reviewed, in July 1856 (Ed. Rev. civ. p. 24.), the German translation of this very curious work by Prince Obolenski and Dr. Posselt, we rejoice to find that a great portion of the original has been printed by the Spalding Club; and it is one of the most interesting volumes in that valuable collection.

‘ more intimate relation subsist between two countries.’ He then proceeds to give two pages of names, concluding with the statement that hundreds of others might be discovered. If hundreds could be discovered, it is obvious that thousands must have ceased to be discoverable.

The fact is, that whereas the relation of Scotland with the other countries to which we have alluded arose from accidental and exceptional enterprises, that with France was the result of a *habit* which was gradually formed, and very slowly abandoned, and which arose from a great variety of causes. Scotchmen of all ranks, conditions, and avocations went to France for all sorts of purposes. Soldiers of fortune, ecclesiastics, invalids in search of health and of medical and surgical treatment,—of these M. Michel gives many instances,—men of letters, men of fashion: some went in pursuit of fame, many in pursuit of gain, not a few with that nobler thirst for intellectual culture which no country in Europe was then so much in a condition to satisfy. To the higher classes of Scotchmen in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, Paris was very much what London has become to their descendants since the Union of the Crowns, and what indeed it probably was to their ancestors in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, before the rupture between the two divisions of the United Kingdom.

To assign all the causes which took Scotchmen to Paris in those days would be as difficult as to mention those which take them to London now. Many, no doubt, went merely because others had gone, because it was the fashion, and their friends were there. Many remained because they had formed habits which rendered Paris indispensable, and—Scotland impossible.

It is very easy to view these facts simply as indications of the necessities of the Scots, and of the poverty and rudeness of their native land. But the question as to whether or not this French connexion was creditable to the Scotch—if it be necessary to discuss it—must be determined by the manner in which they conducted themselves, and the position which they assumed in their adopted country. Viewed in this light, it seems to us that a more unequivocal compliment could scarcely be paid to a nation than that which the pages of M. Michel’s book contain. Taking into account the very large number of instances he has given—the energy displayed by the emigrants, and the splendid success which so often attended their exertions in what then was, far more unquestionably than it is now, the most luxurious, refined, and magnificent capital in Europe, are marvellous proofs of their abilities, whilst the small number of crimes and acts of meanness, or even violence, which he enumerates, is a not less

valuable testimony to their good conduct. Notwithstanding the general charge of insolence perpetuated in the proverb, *fier comme un Écossais*\*, against the highly paid and gaily accoutred soldiers of the guard, even they, up to the time at which the kindly relation between the countries began to be affected by the Reformation and the Union between Scotland and England, enjoyed an amount of popularity very rarely accorded to foreign troops, and which the Scotch did not always reciprocate towards those Gallic allies who from time to time were quartered in Scotland.

Then it is said† that, from first to last, besides a great number of professors and doctors in all the faculties, *not less than thirty Scotchmen held the office of Rector in the University of Paris*. Just let the reader reflect to what an amount of intellectual activity, and of personal respectability and worth, this single fact testifies. If we consider what Paris was then, and what the office of Rector of a University, putting it at the lowest, as at all times, it would have been very noteworthy if three men, in place of thirty, had attained to so high a dignity! In manner, the halls of the University of Padua, in which Galileo taught, were thronged by young Scotchmen of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; their names and well-known escutcheons may still be seen upon the walls, and we have in our own possession the diploma of a ‘nobilis juvenis Scotus’—a Wallace—who graduated there in medicine in 1614.

We have said that the stream by no means ran with equal force in the opposite direction. If we except the regency of Mary of Guise, and the earlier years of the reign of her daughter, when the Court was really French, and when French tradesmen established themselves in Edinburgh in great numbers, the influx of Frenchmen into Scotland has been, comparatively speaking, very limited. Still, there were many—apart from the military expeditions, of which alone we hear anything from the public historians—who came to Scotland, both for private and public purposes. Subsequent to the Reformation, the emigration of Scotch Catholics into France was pretty

---

\* *Jurer comme un Écossais*, it would seem, was the French equivalent for our phrase ‘swear like a trooper.’ In the beginning of his second volume, M. Michel has given some amusing specimens of the jargon with which these men of the sword *affligeaient les oreilles de nos ancêtres*. It is itself a proof of the extent of the connexion, that the *langage escosse-françois* is spoken of by the writers of the period as a well-known patois.

† *Miscellanea Scotica*, vol. iv. p. 19.

well balanced by that of French Protestants into Scotland. James Melville, in his diary, mentions that subscriptions were raised for French Protestants in indigent circumstances in 1575; and Calderwood has a similar notice in 1622. After the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, a colony of French weavers, mostly from Picardy, was established in the locality where Picardy Place now stands. Under the year 1597, the same James Melville records that, 'owing to the fame of 'Andrew Melville, the University of St. Andrews was this year 'attended by a considerable number of foreign youth, Poles, 'Danes, Belgians, and Frenchmen, "whilk crabbit the King 'mickle," Andrew being no favourite of his.'\* So lately as 1861, three princes of the House of Orleans sat on the forms of the High School of Edinburgh. They were distinguished for ability amongst their schoolfellows, and much beloved and cherished by the inhabitants as the last and noblest representatives of the old friendship of the two kingdoms.

It is not so easy a matter as it at first appears to determine when the special relations between France and Scotland originated, or what were the causes which led to the formation of the *habit* amongst Scotchmen of which we have spoken. The common opinion is, that the connexion arose entirely after the attempted conquest of Scotland, which they viewed as a separate Saxon kingdom, by the Norman kings of England, and that it was fostered mainly by the part which the Scotch took in what is known in France as the hundred years' war.

We are quite willing to put out of account at once the treaty between Charlemagne and King Achains, though it figures in the preamble of almost every subsequent treaty, down to the times of Louis XIV., on the ground that neither France nor Scotland existed in the sense of separate treaty-making countries at that day. To account for the connexion by a treaty of which nothing can be either affirmed or denied, reminds us of Müller's ingenious solution of the difficulty of fixing responsibility on poor humanity by ascribing sin to a free act of self-determination anterior to consciousness. If the proposition did not admit of being very satisfactorily established, it was one which no subsequent theologian was very likely to disprove; and the treaty in question, we presume, is equally safe from any search that will ever be made into the archives either of France or Scotland. We are aware, moreover, that the four treaties which M. Michel ascribes to the twelfth century rest upon evidence which is not only questionable, but which has been

---

\* Chambers' Domestic Annals, vol. i. p. 290.

gravely questioned since he wrote ; and we admit that the fact of Alexander III. having sworn his coronation oaths in French is sufficiently accounted for by the Normanising fashion which, in his time, had extended itself to the Scottish Court. Still, there are facts cropping out, here and there, which do not seem to admit of much doubt, and which are scarcely explicable on any other assumption than that the connexion existed anterior to the war. Let us try the effect of a slight comparison of dates. The death of Alexander III., and the accession of the Maiden of Norway, took place in 1286 ; the date of the famous conference of Norham is the 10th of May, 1291, and it was not till 1314 that the battle of Bannockburn was fought. Now, M. Michel informs us that, in 1313, there was a street in Paris in which the Scotch students lived in such numbers that it was known as the Rue d'Ecosse ; that a street bearing a similar name existed at Dieppe, and that in 1292 there were sixty persons of the name of Scot (variously spelt) mentioned in the *Livre de la Taille*, for that year, as permanent residents, and of course persons of some means, in Paris. As surnames by this time were common, and as Scott never was a very common surname in Scotland, sixty Scotts in a condition to pay taxes speak for a considerable resident population of Scotchmen. It is probable, however, that in a foreign country, the national title ' Scot ' was sometimes used in place of a surname. In a subsequent passage M. Michel says, that at the commencement of the fourteenth century, there were numbers of Scotchmen to be found in many of the smaller towns of France, at a great distance from the places of their usual disembarkation. As an example, he mentions a Scotch colony at Mézin in 1327. Nor is M. Michel the only antiquarian who has collected facts bearing in the same direction. Tytler, in his history, and more recently Mr. Innes, both following Mathew Paris, whom the latter characterises as an ' intelligent and ' unsuspected testimony,' mentions the curious fact, that when Louis IX. set out on his memorable expedition to the Holy Land, one of the ships used for the transport of the horses of the men-at-arms was built for a great French lord, the Earl of St. Pol, at Inverness. Taking into account the heterogeneous character of which the crusading hosts consisted, the fact of a French nobleman building a ship at Inverness is far more significant of a connexion between the countries than even the large number of Scotchmen who joined that disastrous expedition. Then, as indicating the extent of the continental trade of Scotland, and the tendency of the Scotch to form continental connexions generally, it is not unimportant to bear in



mind that during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries Flemish colonies have been traced in Berwick, St. Andrews, Perth, Dumbarton, Ayr, Peebles, Lanark, Edinburgh, and in the districts of Renfrewshire, Clydesdale and Annandale. These strangers lived under the protection of a special code of mercantile law; and recent investigations have established the fact, that, a hundred years before the great Baltic Association came into being, we had a Hanseatic league in Scotland, small and unimportant comparatively, but known by that very name. This was in the time of David I., towards the middle of the twelfth century. A hundred years later the chronicler of Lanercost, speaking of the now insignificant town of Berwick-on-Tweed, informs us that it was 'a city so populous, and of such trade, that it might justly be called another Alexandria, whose riches were the sea, and the waters its walls. In those days the citizens, being most wealthy and devout, gave noble alms.' In confirmation of these remarks, Mr. Tytler mentions that the customs of Berwick under Alexander III. amounted to 2,197*l.* 8*s.* sterling, while the whole customs of England in 1287 produced only 8,411*l.* 19*s.* 11½*d.* The trade of Berwick was unquestionably a continental trade, carried on with Flanders, and to a large extent, probably, with the coast of France. Now if we take into account that cities that can by any stretch of the imagination even of a monkish chronicler, be likened to Alexandria are not built in a day—that it is not just after the first few wanderers arrive that streets are called by their name in towns like Paris and Dieppe, where there are a good many both Scotch and English residents to whom no such compliment is paid in our day, and that it must have taken some little acquaintance with Scotland to enable a French noble to fix upon so strange a place as Inverness for ship-building—we may conclude, with some confidence, that, however it may have arisen, there was in point of fact a close connexion between France and Scotland, of long standing, previous to the War of the Succession.

Nor are we at all shaken in this belief, which the mention of long-standing friendship and goodwill in the treaty of 1326 strongly confirms, by the reflection that till the war broke out there was no very special reason for the continuous intercourse of which we seem to find traces between France and Scotland. There is nothing in general that seems more surprising to us than the amount of international intercourse which existed in Europe in the middle ages. We regard it now as a new thing for an English monarch to have travelled as much as our own Prince of Wales. But King Alfred had made the journey to

Rome twice before he was seven years old; and the proceeding was by no means an exceptional one in his day. On the subject of the intercourse which our Saxon ancestors maintained with Rome, Dr. Pauli, in his excellent 'Life of Alfred,' has the following remarks:—

'Ever since the arrival of Augustin, the islanders had preserved an uninterrupted communication with Rome. No long period elapsed till a house was established for the reception of their pilgrims and the instruction of their clergy. We have already seen two kings of the West Saxons die there. It was from the hands of the chief shepherd of Rome that the English archbishops received the pallium, and many bishops their consecration. Offa's name was as familiar at St. Peter's as in the Court of Charles.'

It was by Offa, King of the East Saxons, that the hospital or college over which Cardinal Wiseman presided in our own times, and the Church of the Holy Trinity, subsequently known as that of St. Thomas of Canterbury (Sto. Tommaso degli Inglesi), were founded in 775.

Nor was it Italy alone that was familiar with English faces and English tongues. Every reader of Count Robert of Paris, even if he should have neglected to dip into Ducange, or should have forgotten his Gibbon, is familiar with the Varangian Guard—that body of our countrymen with whom the emperors of the East surrounded themselves, from the battle of Hastings down to the taking of Constantinople, pretty much as their predecessors had done with the Prætorian guards, or as the kings of France did with the Scottish archers.

When was there a merrier 'excursion train' than that which started from the 'Tabard' in Southwark one April morning, somewhere about the year 1383, on a visit to Canterbury? The object of Chaucer was to exhibit the social habits of his time, and, with this view, the characters of the pilgrims whom he has brought together are, as a learned editor has remarked, 'as various as, at that time, could be found in the several departments of *middle* life; that is, in fact, as various as could, with any probability, be brought together, so as to form one company; the highest and the lowest ranks of society 'being necessarily excluded.'\* But what we wish to call attention to is not the habit of home travel to which such an expedition testifies, but the extent to which that of foreign travel is revealed by the account which is given in the prologue of the various members of the party. First we have the knight, who had ridden

---

\* Sir Harry Nicolas, Pickering's edition, vol. i. p. 261.

‘As wel in Christendom as in Hethenese,  
And ever honoured for his worthinesse.’

The next few lines contain a catalogue of his voyages:—

‘At Alisandre he was whan it was wonne.  
Ful often time he hadde the bord begonne,  
Aboven alle nations, in Pruce.  
In Lettowe hadde he reysed and in Ruce,  
No cristen man so ofte of his degre.  
In Gernade at the siege eke hadde he be  
Of Algesir, and ridden in Belmarie.  
At Leyes was he, and at Satalie,  
Whan they were wonne; and in the Grete See,  
At many a noble armee had he be.  
At mortal batailles hadde he ben listene,  
And foughten for our faith at ‘Tramissene,  
In listes threis, and ay slain his foe.  
This ilke worthy knight hadde ben also  
Somtime with the Lord of Palatie,  
Agen another bethen in Turkie,’ &c.

Then there is his son, ‘a lusty bachelor’ of twenty, who has already been

‘in chevachie,  
In Flaunders, in Artois, and in Picardie.’

The merchant and the shipman are travelled men, of course; and we are not surprised to hear that the pardoncr is ‘streit comen from the Court of Rome.’ But it does surprise us a little to learn that the wife of Bath has been *thrice* in Jerusalem, and ‘hadde passed many a strange streme.’

‘At Rome she hadde ben, and at Boloine,  
In Galice at Seint James, and at Coloine.’

The fiction, however, is not stranger than many well-authenticated facts. A very learned friend told us, the other day, that, in his historical researches, he recently came across the traces of a bailie of Peebles, who was just setting out on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem!

Even as regards the mere amount of locomotion, there can be little doubt that we deceive ourselves in supposing it to be so very greatly in favour of modern times. But the increase in the quantity has unquestionably far exceeded that in the quality of travel, if by the quality we understand not its lazy ease, but its efficacy for purposes of human culture and development. In former times, when scarcely any organised means of land transport existed, so ordinary an affair as a journey from London to Rome was itself a positive school of instruction. It was im-

possible for a man to travel over the half of Europe on horseback, or in a litter, still more so to perform the pilgrimage on foot, without going through what amounted to a second education. The most intimate contact with human character, and with external nature, under the greatest variety of circumstances, was perfectly inevitable. There was fatigue to be undergone, unquestionably, and very possibly danger to be encountered; but at the end of the journey the traveller must have felt himself invigorated in body, and filled with new thoughts and feelings, to a very different extent from the modern weakling who is shot along a railway, the noise of which drowns conversation, and the rapidity of which renders vision indistinct. In a marvellously short space of time, no doubt, he finds himself in the Piazza di Spagna, in the midst of a little knot of his countrymen, as ignorant and inexperienced as himself. He gains little by the change of place that he might not have gained by looking at a few photographs, and reading the letters of a newspaper correspondent. The more perfectly travelling is organised, the less instructive and even enjoyable it becomes—a fact which experience brings home rather painfully to those of us who are old enough to contrast the Continent now with what it was even twenty years ago. But it was not only the mode of transport which brought men into more intimate contact in those days. The same effect was produced by the modes of living. The poorer pilgrims were accommodated, M. Michel informs us, from a very early period in France, in *hospices*, free from charge; those whose circumstances were better, or who travelled for secular purposes, enjoying hospitality probably on very much the same terms as at the Grande Chartreuse or the Great St. Bernard at the present day. In the towns, of course, there were hostels and taverns for passers by, whilst those who remained made arrangements with the citizens, perhaps not differing very greatly from those with which we are familiar. But what were altogether peculiar were the educational establishments, where the stranger youth could avail himself of the advantages of foreign instruction in languages and manners without altogether losing the society of his own countrymen. Of institutions of this class the Scotch possessed several in France; and it is very much to be regretted that M. Michel has not presented us with a more complete history of them. Of the famous establishments in Paris and at Douai, the latter of which, for a period, was transferred to Rheims, he has told us scarcely anything beyond what was popularly known; and though he states that when the ecclesiastical committee of the National Assembly presented its report on the 23rd of Oc-

tober, 1790, on the English, Scotch, and Irish religious establishments in France, their number, including monasteries, convents, and colleges, amounted to twenty-four, he does not say even what were the numbers of the different kinds of establishments respectively. Many of them, probably, were mere dependencies of each other. For instance, in the village of Arcueil there was a house belonging 'to a community of Scotch priests,' which community M. Michel conjectures to have been the college of the Rue des Fossés-Saint-Victor, the Scotch college in Paris, which, he says, had other properties in other parts of the country, the most considerable, as the first in date, being that of the estate of Grisy-Suines, near to Brie-Comte-Robert, in the Brie-Parisienne. The total revenues of these establishments amounted to 329,000 livres, and the number of individuals who subsisted on them at the period of the Revolution, professors, students, and *religieux*, was about a hundred and fifty. 'The assembly passed a decree to the effect that these establishments should be continued in their existing condition, with certain modifications. In the same sitting, the demand for an allowance of 6,000 livres by the Irish college of St. Omer, was remitted to the finance committee.' With this very unsatisfactory extract from the 'Scots Magazine' for October, 1790—no very recondite or trustworthy source, surely—this very interesting and important branch of M. Michel's subject is permitted to drop. Of the unsuccessful attempts that have been made, from time to time, by various bodies—the University of Glasgow, the Advocates' Library, and the British Museum—to recover the documents of the Scotch colleges in Paris and at Douai, M. Michel, following for the most part Mr. Innes, has given a full, perhaps we might say a tedious account. Like so much else that was valuable, it is to be feared that these treasures perished during the frenzy of the Revolution, which confiscated their property, as well as that of the numerous Irish endowments in France.\*

But though their archives may be mostly irrecoverable, it could be no very difficult matter to retrace the general outline, at least, of the history of these institutions; and it is scarcely possible to imagine a work which, if executed with reasonable care, and presented in an intelligible form, would be likely, even in a popular sense, more richly to reward an archæologist.

---

\* Under the treaty of Paris in 1814, compensation was made by France to England for the seizure of British property in these establishments, and their claims were subsequently investigated by the Privy Council, in whose records some account of them may be found.

It was not in France alone that they existed, and consequently they were not all subjected to the fury of the Revolution. The Benedictine monastery at Ratisbon, for example, is or ~~was~~ recently a flourishing institution.\* It never belonged to the wealthiest class of ecclesiastical establishments, and to its poverty it was probably indebted for its immunity from plunder; but its possessions, such as they were, have been guarded with loving care; and, within these last few years, we are informed that all the latest improvements in Scottish agriculture have been introduced on its farms, and the newest implements imported from Aberdeenshire by the worthy Superior. This report we give on the authority of an Aberdeenshire gentleman, who enjoyed the hospitality of the Prior some eight years ago. But a recent writer in '*Notes and Queries*' (March 21, 1863), states that the monastery has now been finally dissolved, and the buildings and funds applied to the foundation of a Roman Catholic seminary. At Nuremberg there was a similar establishment, founded by Conrad III., about 1160, and now known as the Gideon Kirche; there was another at Vienna, situated near the Schotten-Thor; and, if we are not greatly mistaken, there were others at Cologne, and Würzburg, and elsewhere. That at Rome, of course, is still well known; but its modern date — (it was founded in 1649 by the Marchioness of Huntley and Count Leslie) — renders it an object of less interest than that at Ratisbon, which dates from the days of Macbeth. As the officials of all these institutions were no doubt in frequent communication with each other, the archives of those which remain would probably throw much light on the history

---

\* The Rev. James Robertson, who was sent by Sir Arthur Wellesley and Mr. Canning in 1808, on a secret mission to the Danish Islands, for the purpose of inducing the Marquis de la Romana to return to Spain in British ships with the Spanish troops then quartered in the Isle of Fünen, was a Scottish Benedictine of this monastery of Ratisbon. The Duke of Richmond, in his travels through Germany towards the end of the last century, had become acquainted with the Abbot Arbuthnot and several other members of that community; and it was through his Grace, then Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, that Mr. Robertson was recommended to Sir Arthur Wellesley, then Irish Secretary. The service he performed was of the highest importance; and we do not remember to have read a more romantic and captivating narrative than the simple account of it which has recently been published in Mr. Robertson's own words, by his nephew Mr. Alexander Clinton Fraser. It was thus that one of these Scotch Benedictine monks successfully defied and defeated Napoleon and his police, when they were at the height of their power.

of the others, and a picture of the external educational institutions of Scotland might still be produced with tolerable completeness.

But the relations in which Scotland stood to the native educational institutions of almost all the countries of Europe, more particularly of France, were even more important for the national development than the institutions which she herself planted and maintained abroad. We have already referred to the surprising number of Scotchmen who attained to the office of Rector in the University of Paris. There is scarcely a single French university of which a tale more or less similar might not be told. M. Michel's pages are thickly studded with notices to this effect; but in place of gathering them together, we shall consult at once the interest of our readers and our own convenience, by presenting them with the following spirited sketch of 'scholarly knight-errants' by Mr. Innes, a writer the clearness and felicity of whose style is not one of the least of his attractions. It refers to the period subsequent to the Reformation and the Union of the Crowns, when all special cause for a French alliance, or for continental leanings on the part of Scotchmen had ceased; and still it shows how tenacious the continental habit proved.

'The want of employment, the insecurity, the poverty at home, only in part explain the crowd of expatriated Scotchmen who were, during those centuries, teaching science and letters in every school of Europe. There was something in it of the adventurous spirit of the country—something of the same knight-errantry which led their unlettered brothers to take service wherever a gallant captain gave hope of distinction and prize-money. It was not enough for one of those peripatetic scholars to find a comfortable niche in a university, where he might teach and gain friends and some money for his old age. The whole fraternity was inconceivably restless, and successful teachers migrated from college to college, from Paris to Louvain, from Orleans to Angers, from Padua to Bologna, as men in later times completed their education by the grand tour. The university feeling and the universal language of that day conduced somewhat to this effect. A graduate of one university was "free" of all. His qualifications were on the surface too, and easily tested. A single conference settled a man's character, where ready Latin and subtle or vigorous disputation were the essential points. But whatever were the causes, the student of the history of those centuries must be struck with the facts. The same period which saw Florence Wilson, Serymger, the elder Barclay, received among the foremost scholars of Europe, in its most learned age, witnessed also three Scotsmen professors at Sedan, at one and the same time, and two, if not three, together at Leyden. John Cameron, admirably learned, lecturing everywhere, everywhere admired, moved in 1600 from Glasgow to

Bergerac, from Bergerac to Sedan, from Sedan to Paris, from Paris to Bordeaux, to Geneva, to Heidelberg, to Saumur, to Glasgow, again to Saumur, to Montauban, there to rest at last. But the type of the class was Thomas Dempster, a man of proved learning and ability, but whose adventures in love and arms, while actually "regenting" at Paris, at Tournay, at Toulouse, at Nismes, in Spain, in England, at Pisa, at Bologna, were as romantic as those of the Admirable Crichton or Cervantes' hero. Incidentally to his own history, Dempster makes us acquainted with four Scotchmen of letters whom he met at Louvain. He visited James Cheyne, a Scotch doctor at Tournay, succeeded David Sinclair as Regent in the College of Navarre at Paris, and was invited by Professor Adam Abernethy and Andrew Currie to join them at Montpellier.\*

Every one's experience or desultory reading must have furnished him with examples of the phase of Scottish enterprise which Mr. Innes has commemorated. They are by no means confined to the period of which Mr. Innes has spoken. On the contrary, they stretch from the beginning of the thirteenth down to the end of the eighteenth century. It was not till the French Republican army entered Holland that the last resident Scotchman quitted the University of Leyden. Nor is the race, as regards students, by any means extinct in our own day. But the latest scholarly knight-errant of the old stamp, whom we ourselves have encountered, is poor Ludwig Ross, so well known at Athens, first as conservator of antiquities, and afterwards as a professor in the University, and whose premature death at Halle, in 1859, was deplored even in learned Germany as a serious loss to philological learning. In the interesting sketch of his life which his friend Otto Jahn has appended to a posthumous collection of his more ephemeral writings†, he informs us that Ross's family, which had been settled for several generations in Holstein, sprang from the North of Scotland, and that many traits in his own character and bearing constantly recalled his origin. Maternally he was a German, and German was his mother tongue; but by the father's side of the house he seems to have been a twig of that vigorous branch of the well-grown tree of the Rosses, or Roses, of which the genial king of riflemen is the head, and Ludwig, it seems, was accustomed, like a good Scotchman, to boast that his chief was a member of the Reformed Parliament, and that his shield displayed three *water-bougets*, in token of the crusading exploits of his ancestors.

---

\* Sketches of Early Scottish History, p. 280, *et seq.*

† Erinnerungen und Mittheilungen aus Griechenland. Berlin: 1863.



Ross's case, however, is a complete illustration of what we have already mentioned—viz., that, whereas those who went to France preserved for many generations their connexion with Scotland, those who went to the North of Europe almost immediately ceased to be Scotchmen. For practical purposes, the fact of his origin bound him as little to Scotland as the fact that his ancestor was a Crusader bound him to Palestine, and neither Scotland nor Holstein was the better or the worse for his accidental transference from the one to the other. Something very closely analogous, no doubt, occurred in many of the cases mentioned by M. Michel, where Scotchmen were entirely absorbed by the population of France. With those who were members of the greater families of Scotland, the Stuarts, Douglasses, Hamiltons, Lindsays, Crawfurds, Setons, and the like,—who fought in the hundred years' war, who conquered at Bauges, or fell on the fatal fields of Crevant or Verneuil, this would not readily occur. Even those of them, like the Douglasses Dukes of Touraine, the Stuarts Lords of Aubigné, and the Hamiltons Dukes of Chatelherault, who became the possessors of great estates in France, for the most part retained property in Scotland, or their near relatives did so; and, at any rate, their connexion with the Court which, both in France and in Scotland, had a very cosmopolitan character, would readily keep up their intercourse with their countrymen. But of the 'dix mille chevaliers et braves soldats,' for example, who took service under the banner of Archibald, second Earl of Douglas, in 1422, and of whom the colonists who still exist at La Forêt, in the neighbourhood of Bourges, are very probably the descendants, it is natural to suppose that but few would maintain a Scottish connexion after the second generation. The same may very likely have been the case with the vast majority of those soldiers of fortune of a somewhat higher rank who married French wives, and settled down in the provinces, and whose family histories M. Michel has succeeded in disinterring. Of their Scottish origin, their names leave no possible doubt, for they are just the common names of Scotland at the present day,—Boyd's, Chambers's, Cunninghams, Moncreiffs, Turnbells, Gorries, Dodd'ses, Crichtons, Foulises, Monipennys, Lockharts, Morrisons, Pattullo's, and Thomsons, the last being the founders of the *maison noble de Thomesson ou Tonneson*! Those of our countrymen who have a taste for orthographical distinctions, may find their account in consulting M. Michel's pages. There is not one of the Scotch names that we have mentioned which is not spelt in half a dozen ways; and this for the most part so as in no-

wise to obscure its identity. In other respects, too, our readers may discover what will be 'to their advantage.' The members of the great house of Thomson will be gratified to learn, 'that there is not the slightest reason to doubt that that family was considered as belonging to the good old nobility,' that Geoffroy de Tonnesson was Seigneur de Remenecourt, that 'Marie de Tonesson married Antoine des Armoises, Seigneur de Neuville, whose daughter Henriette married François de Nathan-court, Seigneur de Passavant and of other places, who died in 1660,' &c. Some families that never gave proof of the prolific qualities to which that just mentioned may certainly lay claim, had a wonderfully brilliant career in France. Of these, the Pittillochs, or Pattullos, of whom some representatives still exist in Fife and Angus, are a prominent example. In the eventful year 1124, in which the battle of Verneuil was fought, Robert Pittilloch, of Dundee, landed in France, accompanied by a brave band of followers, and rendered such service to Charles VII., chiefly in the south of France, that he received and long retained the name of *le petit roi de Gascogne*. He was a mere soldier of fortune, but he rose to be Governor of Castelnau, in Médoc, and captain of the Scottish guard, an office of the very highest distinction, in which we afterwards find another David Pitulo, no doubt his descendant, to whose honour, we are told, a statue was erected by Louis XI. Later still, in 1758, another member of the same family dedicated to Madame de Pompadour an *Essai sur l'Amélioration des Terres*.

But though individuals of this class, for all directly political purposes, were no doubt entirely merged in the population of France, it is evident that their existence in the very great numbers in which they are even now traceable, must, considering the strong feelings of kindred and of country for which Scotchmen have always been distinguished, have given, for many generations, a home feeling to all other Scotchmen in France greatly beyond what any Briton experiences in any continental country at the present day.

Previous to the Reformation, the Church was everywhere the great binding link between different nations, as it was between different classes of society. In both senses it was emphatically *la carrière ouverte*, and between two countries bound together as France and Scotland were by so many other ties, this was peculiarly the case. It was to promotion in France quite as much as in Scotland, that an ambitious young churchman looked, and it would be no difficult matter to produce a long list of Scotchmen who attained to French ecclesiastical preferments of a very distinguished kind. John Carmichael was

Bishop of Orleans, Andrew Foreman was Archbishop of Bourges, David Bethune was Bishop of Mirepoix, and it was at the instance of Francis I. that he received the Cardinal's Hat; James Bethune, his nephew, the Archbishop of Glasgow, was Abbot of L'Abbie, an office which was also held by another Scotchman named David Panter, or Panton. John Beaton, James's brother, was Canon of St. Quentin. It was the James Bethune, just mentioned, who left to the Scots College what was then considered the enormous sum of 80,000 livres, saved, it was said, during his long residence as ambassador at Paris, from the benefice we have mentioned, and other ecclesiastical preferments which he held in France. To these conspicuous and well-known instances it would not be difficult to add many others of Scotchmen of less note who held minor preferments in the French Church. In proof of the fact that the higher ecclesiastical dignitaries, at all events, preserved their connexion with Scotland unimpaired by their French appointments, it may be sufficient to remind the reader that during Andrew Foreman's short tenure of the archbishopric of Bourges he continued to be Bishop of Moray, and that the result of those complicated political and ecclesiastical intrigues between popes, emperors, and kings which M. Michel has recounted, was that he became Archbishop of St. Andrews; whilst David Bethune was at one and the same time Rector of Campsie, Abbot of Aberbrothick, Bishop of Mirepoix in France, Archbishop of St. Andrews, Cardinal of St. Stephen in Monte Calio, and—Chancellor of Scotland!

After the Reformation, the ties which had been contracted under the influence of a common faith were riveted by persecution. The Roman Catholic families of Scotland, fiercely opposed by the leaders of the Scottish National Church, naturally learned to look for sympathy and support to their co-religionaries of France. The Stuarts themselves were guilty of this offence against the majesty and independence of England, and it cost them the throne: and down to the fatal expedition of the Pretender in '45, buoyed up to the last by false hopes of French assistance, the capricious patronage of the Court of Versailles kept alive this old traditional delusion of the Jacobites. But it is no slight proof of the influence of Scotchmen in France, that a Berwick commanded her armies, a Law administered her finances, and a Macdonald rose to be one of the marshals of Napoleon I.

It used to be said that the establishment of permanent embassies in Europe took place subsequently to the Peace of Westphalia, in 1648; and even the latest edition of Mr.

Wheaton's 'Elements' gives countenance to this view. By those who claim for them a somewhat greater antiquity, their introduction (with the exception of the nuncios and legates of the popes, who confessedly resided permanently at an earlier period) is generally ascribed to Ferdinand the Catholic, as we had occasion to show from Dr. Puebla's despatches in our last Number. The statement is one which anything approaching to an intimate acquaintance with the earlier history of any one of the older European countries will equally serve to invalidate. The works before us, at all events, place it beyond question that long before the latter period, and probably before the former, the intimate relation which subsisted between France and Scotland had led to the custom of maintaining resident political agents at both Courts. M. de la Motte, for example, in Scotland, and Andrew Foreman in France, seem each to have been intrusted with a general mission. It is well known that Cardinal Bethune, or Beaton, as he is called in Scotland, resided at Paris from 1519 to 1525, and on two subsequent occasions, for shorter periods, in the character of an ordinary ambassador. Somewhat later, his nephew, James Beaton, succeeded him in that capacity. He served not only before the Reformation, but was subsequently employed by James VI.; and when he died in 1603, in his eighty-sixth year, he had been ambassador to three generations of the royal family of Scotland, had seen six kings of France, and transacted business with five of them. M. Teulet's 'Papiers d'Etat,' indeed, are mainly composed of instructions to and letters from resident ambassadors, and he mentions expressly their *discontinuance* during the troubled years which succeeded the imprisonment of Queen Mary in Lochleven, when the English influence was in the ascendant, as a departure from the ancient usage. 'After the imprisonment of Mary Stuart at Loch Leven,' he says, 'the ambassador Du Croc returned to France, and during nearly twenty years there were no more resident ambassadors in Scotland, *mais seulement des envoyés chargés de missions temporaires.*'

There was an old house in the Cowgate of Edinburgh, traditionally known as the residence of the French Ambassador, and in Wilson's 'Memorials' will be found an engraving of the edifice called the French Ambassador's Chapel, which was pulled down so lately as 1829. When not actually at war with England, both France and Scotland maintained constant diplomatic relations with that country. We frequently come upon Spanish ambassadors also, resident in all the three countries, and hear of Frenchmen, Englishmen, and Scotchmen, who were

resident in Spain. The extent to which Spain was mixed up in the transactions of England, Scotland, and France in the sixteenth century, has received very important additional illustration from a portion of M. Teulet's very interesting and important collection. Speaking of the 44th section of his work, he says:—

‘The pieces collected in this section are all taken from the same register (*Angleterre XXI*), in the Archives of the Ministère des Affaires Étrangères. It is a contemporary collection of the greatest authenticity, which comprises principally the correspondence of the Duchess of Parma, the Duke of Alba, Perrenot, and the Baron de Glajon, with Philip II., relating to the intervention of Spain in the disputes between France and England on the subject of Scotland in 1559 and 1560, when Francis II., become King of France and Scotland, resolved to send into his new States sufficient forces to reduce his revolted subjects. This correspondence, which extends from the 22nd of August, 1559, to 21st of May, 1560, seemed to us the more important because historians do not mention this intervention of Spain between France and England. It is curious to study, in the documents it contains, the opinion of the Spaniards on the respective strength of the two States, and to see how they came to the profound conviction that England was absolutely incapable of offering any certain resistance to an invasion by France. These documents were, therefore, sufficiently interesting to be published; but they exhibit all the faults of Spanish diplomatic correspondence in the sixteenth century, being almost always long, diffuse, and wearisome to the reader. We could not modify the text itself; but we have suppressed the despatches which were mere repetitions of the others.’\*

It is not very clear to what extent the envoy of those days was surrounded by the ambassadorial staff of later times. The mission seems, however, generally to have consisted of several individuals; and that amongst these was included a secretary of legation, results from such facts as that Throckmorton's secretary was bribed, and furnished to the French Ambassador, La Forest, a portion of the documents published by M. Teulet!

These facts conclusively dispose of the common opinion that the permanent embassy is a modern institution, which took the place occupied by the Church as an international link in European society, down to the period of the Reformation. Long before the Reformation, the embassy existed alongside of the Church; sometimes, though by no means necessarily or constantly, in connexion with it; and its existence is one more proof, added to the many we have adduced, in support of the view that the relations between neighbouring European States were in general quite as intimate, and those between France

---

\* *Teulet, Preface, p. xiv.*

and Scotland far more intimate, in earlier than in modern times.

There can be little doubt that Henry II. entertained the hopeless and irrational project of incorporating Scotland with France. M. Teulet has given, from a document in the Dupuy Collection, a decision of the Parliament of Paris, by which it was declared that, Mary Stuart having entered her twelfth year, Scotland should henceforth be governed in her name by French delegates,—a decision which, as M. Teulet justly remarks, could have been competently arrived at by the Parliament of Scotland alone. Such was probably also the object of the government of Mary of Guise, and of her indiscreet employment of French officials,—a measure which more than anything else tended to alienate the affections of the Scotch. But such was not the object of the Parliament of Scotland in reciprocating the general letters of naturalisation which Henry had issued, nor does there seem any ground for alleging such an intention against the kings of France, either before this period or after—from Louis XII. in 1513 to Louis XIV. in 1646—almost all of whom adopted similar measures. In conferring the right of possessing all benefices, dignities, and ecclesiastical offices, lands, and seigneuries, of acquiring and holding heritable and moveable property, of transmitting it, free from the *Droit d'Aubaine*, and of being ‘treated, favoured, held, deemed, and ‘reputed for ever, as true originals of the kingdom,’ the object was not incorporate union, but firm and intimate alliance; and we have already seen how well that object was accomplished. One of the most immediate and inevitable results of such relations as these, and one which does not follow at all from the exchange of mercantile commodities, however extensive, is intermarriages. We find, accordingly, that the Scotch who settled in France almost invariably married French wives, leaving behind them a progeny who were bound to both countries by stronger ties than either of their parents. It is thus that elements of national repulsion are overcome, and bonds of national union artificially created. How much more powerful these bonds are than any which arise from common interest, or mere political arrangements, the modern history of Europe most abundantly testifies.

- ART. IX.—1. *The Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man, with Remarks on Theories of the Origin of Species by Variation.* By SIR CHARLES LYELL, F.R.S., &c. 8vo. 1863.
2. *Antiquités Celtiques et Antédiluviennes.* Par M. BOUCHER DE PERTHES. 8vo. Paris. Vol. I. 1847. Vol. II. 1857.
3. *Machoire humaine découverte à Abbeville dans un terrain non rémanié*; Note de M. BOUCHER DE PERTHES, présentée par M. DE QUATREFAGES (*Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences*). 20 Avril, 1863.
4. *Note sur l'authenticité de la découverte d'une machoire humaine et de haches de silex dans le terrain diluvien de Moulin Quignon.* Par M. MILNE-EDWARDS (*Comptes Rendus*, 18 Mai 1863).
5. *On the Occurrence of Flint Implements, associated with the Remains of Animals of Extinct Species, &c.* By JOSEPH PRESTWICH, Esq., F.R.S. (*Philosophical Transactions*, 1860.)
6. *Prehistoric Man, Researches into the Origin of Civilization in the Old and New World.* By DANIEL WILSON, LL.D. 8vo. 2 vols. 1862.

SIR CHARLES LYELL has not only been the witness of an amount of progress and change in the science of Geology, formerly unprecedented in the life of one man—we might perhaps also add, unprecedented in the case of any other science—but he has personally contributed in no slight or indirect manner to this progress and to this change. Born shortly before the close of last century, and educated at Oxford, where he was the pupil of Buckland, his after life has been chiefly spent in London, where he has been the interested and indefatigable observer of what was passing in the world of science. The influences of an Oxford education acted upon his acute and highly speculative mind by a kind of antagonism. Mr. Lyell was no granter of propositions. He was soon 'led to reflect on the precept of Descartes, that a philosopher should once in his life doubt everything he had been taught;'<sup>\*</sup> an amount of philosophical scepticism of which his writings from first to last give ample proof. Passing over some comparatively juvenile papers, his first work—'The Principles of Geology'—appeared, a volume at a time, com-

<sup>\*</sup> Preface to vol. iii. of first edition of 'Principles of Geology.'

mencing in 1830. The earliest volume was, however, mainly written in 1828. The vigour of its style, the originality and novelty of its contents, and the importance of the conclusions sought to be deduced from the facts detailed, secured for it at once a measure of popular and scientific attention attained by no geological work—hardly excepting even Cuvier's researches on fossil remains,—perhaps by no other scientific work of the period. What is equally remarkable, the popularity of the 'Principles of Geology' has continued nearly unabated for thirty years, amidst the incessant and restless progress of the science of which it treats. This arose in part from the fact that Mr. Lyell had the sagacity and good fortune to anticipate the track in which the study of geology was about to be pursued. Unlike his master, Buckland, whose most systematic and original work, the '*Reliquiæ Diluvianæ*,' was the representative of a geological school even then on the wane, Mr. Lyell courageously maintained opinions at the time and for long after to some extent unpopular, not so much in themselves as in the consequences which they were supposed to involve. He had the advantage, however, of seeing adherents year by year resorting to his standard, instead of deserting it; and if he has from time to time frankly abandoned earlier expressed opinions, it has almost always been in the direction of carrying out farther than he had originally felt entitled to do, the consequences of his own early principles of inquiry and argument.

But Sir Charles Lyell could not have maintained his very conspicuous place amongst the geologists of Europe, had he not united with his facility and fearlessness in forming conceptions from which many men would have shrunk, an ability and perseverance in maintaining, illustrating, and diffusing them, which have often been wanting in the most eminent thinkers, and in the most diligent cultivators of the physical and natural sciences. Himself one of the earlier members and most zealous promoters of the Geological Society of London, he selected a position considerably different from that of most of his compeers. Instead of writing elaborate monographs on certain formations and on certain features of local geology, he stored up the facts which he accumulated as well by judicious study as by personal intercourse with other geologists, and by his own powers of observation; at one and the same time collecting and classifying; and referring each fact, to which he devoted his special attention, to its place in that system of which he had previously formed a theoretical conception. Living in the midst of the scientific activity of London, his time was yet saved from the distraction and anxiety which the



rapid production and publication of detached memoirs are apt to produce; as well as from the attendant controversies, and the other claims on the time of those who are deeply engrossed in the management and support of scientific associations. Sir Charles Lyell could afford to dispense with the flattering popularity and seductive social influence which such surrenders of personal independence and tranquillity are expected to attain. He adopted the dignified position at once of the student and of the methodical teacher, and he has no reason to regret his choice. In this respect he may be fitly compared with another eminent Englishman, not less distinguished in the exact than Sir Charles Lyell is in the natural sciences, whom he also resembles in the lucidity of his style and the admirable method of his systematic writings.

The 'Principles of Geology,' as well as all the subsequent writings of our author, were mainly devoted to the development of the idea that contemporary changes in the distribution of the materials of the earth's surface are the same in kind, and probably also in degree, as those which obtained in past ages, which, acting through absolutely indefinite periods of time, have brought about those changes of which we trace the undeniable records in the succession and accidents of the strata of the upper portion of our globe. Properly speaking, there was nothing absolutely new in the attempt to collect evidence of the changes going on concurrently with the present order of the world, or to estimate their amount and efficacy. Nor was it any novelty to invoke the aid of vast periods of time in explaining, by the analogy of the Present, a great number, if not all, of the changes manifest in the records of the Past. In the interesting historical chapters of the 'Principles,' Sir C. Lyell enumerated most of his predecessors in this line of thought; scarcely, perhaps, giving due prominence to the industry of Von Hoff\* in the collection of the facts of contemporary change, or to the bold speculations and memorable labours of Hutton† and Playfair‡, in educing a system of dynamical geology, very similar to his own, from the comparatively meagre data which were available at the time they wrote. But after allowing all credit to the geologists of the 18th century, we may fairly admit that the time had arrived when speculation on the principles of the science could be advantageously renewed with the light of fresh researches,

---

\* Geschichte der Natürlichen Veränderungen der Erdoberfläche. I. Theil. 1822.

† Theory of the Earth. 2 vols. 1795.

‡ Illustrations of the Huttonian Theory of the Earth. 8vo. 1802.

especially that derived from the study of fossil organic remains. The battle of Wernerianism and Huttonianism had been pretty well fought out within the sphere of the original controversy—but new data had arisen which tended to give the whole subject a fresh aspect.

Nothing contributed more to this result than the opening of the continent to British men of science, and it is plain upon the face of Sir C. Lyell's work that, though not in its origin the result of his journeys to the south of Europe (commencing in 1828), these and his visits to the museums of Paris gave their characteristic impress to every part of the '*Principles of Geology*.' It was a splendid success, and secured for the author permanent fame. Successive editions showed that he had determined to make it the repertory of his most original observations, and the authentic expression of his matured conclusions. As year by year he extended the circuit of his journeys, sedulously observing himself, and treasuring the facts communicated by resident geologists of various countries, it is needless to say that the materials of his work largely increased. Germany and Scandinavia were diligently explored, and twice he crossed the Atlantic with his eye ever fixed on the class of phenomena—those connected with existing physical change—forming the nucleus around which all his geological system was to cohere. The study of volcanoes, which he commenced in Central France, he extended to Spain, Sicily, and the Canaries. Of these various widely-spread investigations he published some of the methodised results apart; as, for example, on the changes of level of the land in Scandinavia, in a paper in the '*Philosophical Transactions*,'\* on the numerous facts observed in America in two series of published '*Travels*' in that country†; and on the formation of volcanic cones, especially of Etna, in the '*Philosophical Transactions*' again.‡ But the pith and substance of all that he saw and inferred was compressed into his methodical writings. Each new edition of his great work was in some sense a new book. Notwithstanding all possible curtailments, so much original matter could not be introduced without unduly increasing its bulk; and in a few years, the work was judiciously subdivided into two: one portion retaining the name of '*Principles*,' in which the phenomena of geology are considered chiefly with reference to existing causes, or in

---

\* *Phil. Trans.* for 1835.

† Published in 1841 and 1845.

‡ *Phil. Trans.* for 1858.

their dynamical aspect; the other, or the 'Manual,' embracing the systematic geology and palæontology of the entire formations of the globe. It is to the unusual care and ability with which these works have been from time to time re-edited and brought up to the level of the science of which they treat, that their permanent popularity is justly attributable.

We have already seen that the fundamental idea in Sir Charles Lyell's mind is, that the events of the Past are to be viewed by the light of the Present. We might almost have said, to be viewed *exclusively* by the light of the present. And here, no doubt, is the weak point of what has justly been called the *Uniformitarian* School, as opposed to *Catastrophists*. We do not enter upon this discussion at present. All are agreed that the analogies of existing causes ought to guide us, as far as is possible or reasonable, in the interpretation of the past. And since we find in those strata of the globe which are nearest to its surface and to the chief scene of present change, the most striking analogy in materials, in disposition, and in imbedded organic remains, to strata either forming under our eyes or known to have been deposited in historic times, it requires no circumlocution to show that the argument from analogy is applicable with the greatest force to these upper formations. From these strata, again, analogies may be established with those a little more removed from modern age and existing life, and so on downwards, until a connected chain of analogies may be made to connect even very ancient and profoundly-seated rocks with the subjects of recent change. It is very easy to see that an argument of this kind may be skilfully elaborated, of which it may be difficult to show the defective connexion at any one point, but which, nevertheless, demands more in the way of cordial assent than most readers may be prepared to grant.

The Newer Formations, then—those deposited anterior to historic record, and constituting the less consolidated portion of the earth's crust—rarely, indeed, entitled to the name of *rocks* at all—became the favourite scene of Sir C. Lyell's researches. They had been almost ignored as subjects of methodical geological treatment, until the generation arose to which our author may be said to belong. Under the vague names of diluvium and alluvium, they were hardly ever classified as members of geological formations down to the time of Cuvier and Brongniart, and were regarded, if not as properly speaking *modern*, at all events as belonging to the physical monuments of the *present age* of the world, the very oldest of them being attributed to a date which, if not Historical, at least

might be so. In a word, a very large class of well-informed geologists admitted that these beds of clay, gravel, sand, and similar movable materials, had been deposited by the Noachian deluge, whilst others, waiving the Scriptural question, left it open to attribute these unconsolidated formations to at least a period so comparatively recent as to belong rather to history than geology. As Tertiary geology may be held to have commenced with Cuvier, Quaternary, or the latest formations preceding the present age, became a fixed part of geology mainly through the labours of Sir Charles Lyell and a few of his contemporaries.

We are thus brought step by step, nearer to the inquiry which has called forth the work at the head of this article, 'The Antiquity of Man.' This momentous and interesting question is in fact one portion only of a wider subject—the theory and classification of the most recent formations of our globe. Sir Charles Lyell's new volume is a dissertation upon the geology of the upper formations. Much in it has no direct reference to human antiquity, yet the question of that antiquity is, so to speak, the dominant question of this inquiry, because when we talk of the *present age* of the world, and of the Historical Period, we refer, tacitly at least, to the presence of Man upon the globe, as the intelligent spectator and possible chronicler of the changes to which his species has been the witness.

Before geology could be said to have become a science, the tendency of the uninstructed mind was to see human remains in every chance fossil, as for example, the *homo diluvii testis* of Scheuchzer, which was shown by Cuvier to be a species of salamander. Elephantine bones dug up near Lucerne were described as those of a giant 18 feet high, and even Spallanzani erred in supposing the osseous breccia of Cerigo to contain human relics.

As a knowledge of anatomy became more general, and the spoils of the strata were more attentively considered and collected, the more enlightened belief of geologists turned to an opposite conclusion, and the occurrence of fossil human remains was altogether denied. Such was the deliberate conviction of Cuvier and other great men of his time, the only important apparent exception, that of the Guadeloupe skeleton, being accounted for by the fact that the calcareous rock in which it occurred is in the process of actual formation. It is remarkable that little should have occurred to disturb this belief during the thirty years of indefatigable research—more, far more, in amount than that of a whole preceding century—which elapsed from the time of the publication of Cuvier's memorable work, 'Recherches sur les Ossements Fossiles.' In the celebrated

*Introduction on the Revolutions of the Globe*, Cuvier clearly lays down, as the result of his researches, that since the earth was sufficiently free from water to support terrestrial animals, four distinct ages or great periods followed in succession — the age of reptiles, that of palæotheria, that of the mammoth and mastodon, and lastly that of Man. This belief, we say, has continued, with scarcely an exception, to be the universal geological creed until now. . The tendency of the discoveries which have given rise to Sir C. Lyell's new work (founded mainly on the observation of other geologists verified by himself) is to make the last two ages of Cuvier graduate into one, or at least to extend the human period back to the later portion of the mammoth age. This is a view important, certainly, and requiring careful proof, because anterior research had led to contrary conclusions, and thrown the date of Man to the latest verge of the geological record. But it is not in itself antecedently improbable, and need occasion no violent surprise. Cuvier himself, in the discourse already cited, quotes the fact as the result simply of observation, and even in that respect as by no means conclusively proving that Man did not exist along with the mammoths. He believes that Man might have inhabited limited territories, and after a series of catastrophes have re-peopled the earth.\*

We shall consider presently the few cases which throw any real doubt on the assertion of Cuvier, which in his time was unquestionably correct. Alleged fossil human bones have been and are justly regarded with considerable scepticism.

But a discovery of little inferior interest has been made. Implements of flint, which appear to have been fashioned with evident design, have been found abundantly at depths of at least twenty feet below the surface of the soil, and *that* (as is maintained) not in strata belonging to the formations of the present day, such as peat and recently-washed sands and gravels, but in strata, incoherent, no doubt, and unconsolidated, yet whose ancient deposition is marked by their relations to the present physical configuration of the country and position of existing river-beds, and also by the occurrence of numerous imbedded fossils of extinct animals of characters thoroughly identified by Cuvier, and which belonged to the mammoth period. Indeed, it fortunately happened that the identical beds, in the valley of the Somme, near Abbeville and Amiens, which first yielded flint implements in such abundance, had been, so to speak, made

---

\* 'Ossements Fossiles' (edit. 1834), i. 217.; and Jameson's Translation, p. 120.

classical by Cuvier on account of the abundant and characteristic remains of extinct species of elephant, rhinoceros, bear, and hyæna, which they had contributed to his celebrated museum.

We shall leave for a little while the work of Sir Charles Lyell, to make the reader acquainted, from original sources, with the history of the interesting discovery of these flint weapons. The credit of it is unquestionably due to M. Boucher de Perthes, of whose work we have given the title at the head of our article. It consists of two volumes entitled '*Antiquités Celtiques et Antédiluviennes*.' The first volume was printed in 1847, but only appeared in 1849; the second in 1857. In both we have the history of the Abbeville fossil relics.

M. de Perthes is a gentleman of fortune, who also holds (or held) an official position under government. It appears that twenty-five years ago he was already devoted to antiquarian pursuits, and that he had then made special inquiry into the origin of Man and the probable date of his appearance on the globe. In his first work (which we have not seen), under the title of '*De la Création, Essai sur l'Origine et la Progression des Êtres*,' published at Paris in 1838, it appears that he boldly, though somewhat hypothetically, maintained his conviction that human fossil remains would be eventually found amongst those of the great mammifera. The grounds of this inference might not be sufficient to satisfy geologists now, but as in numberless other instances which the history of science offers, inadequate or not, they sufficed to engage the author in a course of persevering research, which in time led him to nearly a full realisation of his early ideas. No doubt it may be said that a discovery preceded by a hypothetical prediction must be received with hesitation. Certainly the fact justifies a sceptical inquiry into the circumstances and the proofs. This inquiry has been made. For more than twenty years; M. de Perthes was in some measure a victim to the incredulity, whether reasonable or the reverse, of his countrymen and of geologists generally. No one, however, we think, can read his book—independently even of recent testimony—without a thorough conviction of M. de Perthes' entire veracity and good faith; and that, moreover, he used every precaution which skill and caution could suggest to prevent imposition from being practised on himself and others.

The facts, then, are these. In the gravel pits which abound near the town of Abbeville, where M. de Perthes resides, flint implements more or less rude, but unquestionably fashioned by human hands, were first recognised at a great depth below the

surface of the soil. The geological relations and position of these beds we will by-and-by consider. In 1840 or 1841, M. de Perthes was collecting mammalian fossils from this ancient gravel for M. Cordier of Paris. The locality, as we have said, was already well characterised by the researches of Cuvier on similar fossils long before procured for him by M. Baillon. In order to accompany the bones with a portion of the matrix or gravel in which they were embedded, the workmen were desired by M. de Perthes to bring to his house a quantity of it. On pouring out the gravel he noticed amongst it an unpolished flint axe (*hache Celtique*), very regularly formed by chipping. The workmen had not noticed it; but on having it pointed out to them they said that they frequently met with such, but had taken little account of them (*ils n'en avaient point fait de cas*). This narrative \* appears to be perfectly satisfactory. The evidence for the authenticity of these early discoveries is indeed far more convincing than any which can now, or could for the last dozen years, have been easily obtained. It tallies exactly with what occurred to Mr. Prestwich on his first visit (at a much later period) to the analogous English deposit at Hoxne in Suffolk; the workman there, on being shown an implement from Abbeville, at once said that he had often found such in the pit, and had thrown two away recently, one of which he recovered in the rubbish.† At the same place sixty years before, when these weapons were far more abundantly found than now, Mr. Frere was told by a workman that ‘before he knew that they were objects of curiosity he had emptied baskets full of them into the ruts of the adjoining road.‡

Subsequently to 1841, the implements were seen at Abbeville in the matrix, by M. de Perthes (and also by others), and removed with his own hands. It was in vain, however, that he attempted to extend a conviction of the contemporaneity of these weapons or tools with the relics of extinct animals, beyond the circumscribed limits of the *Société d'Émulation* at Abbeville, and the friends or rare passing travellers who could be induced to visit his museum, and there judge for themselves. Of those who did so, M. de Perthes leads us to believe (and we have no doubt of it) that few left it unconvinced. But the just ambition of a Frenchman is to obtain the recognition of his discoveries and their results by the Academy of Sciences. Like other

---

\* ‘Antiquités Celtiques,’ &c., tom. i. p. 256., where farther details are given.

† Phil. Trans. for 1860, p. 306.

‡ ‘Archæologia,’ vol. xiii., quoted by Mr. Prestwich.

great incorporations, it is, however, proverbially difficult to be moved, most of all by persons of slight or of merely provincial reputation. At last, in 1847, a mixed Commission was appointed by the Academies of Sciences and of Inscriptions, to inspect the evidences of M. de Perthes' allegations. M. Jomard, on the part of the latter, reported as to the weapons being almost all true antiques, but it seems to be indicated that the report of the Geological Committee represented by M. Constant Prevost, if it was ever made, was not so favourable as to the matter of their association with fossil bones.\*

We may also safely allow that in every such inquiry a large amount of scepticism in admitting a fact such as that which we are now considering, and which involves some nice points of evidence, is both excusable and just. First of all, *do these alleged antiquities bear certain evidence of design in their construction?* Any doubts which may have existed, even till recently in the minds of some, on this fundamental question have been, we conceive, so completely set at rest by full investigation, that we shall for brevity's sake accept the fact as proved.

But admitting the human character of these tools, we next inquire *whether they are true antiques or modern fabrications?* There can be no doubt that the temptation to make spurious imitations has been considerable; nay, it is difficult to deny that in too many cases deception has been practised. The fashioned flints have had from the first a commercial value. M. de Perthes, twenty years ago, gave from two to five francs for a specimen. He prudently added the farther inducement of a double price were he apprised of the discovery of a specimen before its removal from the matrix. To do him justice, he seems from the first to have had a just suspicion of imposture. As a collector and antiquary, he had already been subjected to the tricks of the designing†, and he took every precaution against error. He believes that the labour of constructing an elaborately formed 'hache' from a rough flint would not be repaid by the sums which he was in the habit of paying for them.‡ He relies with most confidence on having seen numerous tools still imbedded in the firm matrix, from which he removed them with his own hands, and especially on the stain which the surface of the flint receives from the yellow gravel in contact

---

\* We have searched the 'Comptes Rendus' in vain for any notice of the Report of the Commission having been brought up.

† 'Antiquités Celtiques,' ii. 456., and elsewhere.

‡ This was probably true formerly, but it may be doubted whether it applies since the English market has been opened to the *terrassiers* of Abbeville and Amiens.



with it in the true fossil beds\*, which penetrates to a sensible depth into its substance, and which M. de Perthes well describes as a true *patina*, such as antiquaries value in ancient coins, being, in the one case as in the other, inimitable by art and a real safeguard against forgery. •

It is satisfactory to add that in this conclusion the eminent English geologist, Mr. Prestwich, entirely coincides. 'This 'staining,' he adds, 'is so strong and permanent that no subsequent exposure can remove it.'† There are two farther tests of antiquity to which Sir C. Lyell (*Antiq. of Man*, p. 116.) attributes much importance as incapable of artificial imitation; first, a 'vitreous gloss as contrasted with the dull aspect of freshly 'fractured flint;' and secondly, presence of dendritic crystallisations on the fashioned faces.

The next question is, are these remains not only ancient, but *do they belong to the beds characterised by the remains of extinct animals?* On this point doubts have also been raised, and they have probably been the last to be removed in the minds of sceptical inquirers. Were these hatchets obtained by the workmen from Celtic graves or comparatively recent deposits of peat and alluvial soil, and then represented to have been found in the old gravels; or again, without presuming fraud, might they not have become mixed up with an older formation by land slips or rents caused by artificial excavation? In answer to the former supposition, M. de Perthes pertinently remarks; first, that the form and finish of the implements of the later or true Celtic age, and even from the peat formations, are quite distinct in character from those of the ancient deposits; secondly, that their *colour* is also different in conformity with what has been stated under the last head, corresponding to the different characters of the matrix; thirdly, that the flints of the older type are actually more abundant in the district than those of the newer type, so that he has habitually paid the workmen more highly for the more modern article, and yet has accumulated in his museum only one fourth of the number compared to the ancient. Lastly, that he has extracted weapons with his own hands from the lower gravels nearly in contact with the inferior chalk. Later writers coincide generally with these conclusions.‡

---

\* It may also be brown or simply dull white, in accordance with the character of the matrix.

† Prestwich, *Phil. Trans.*, 1861, p. 297.

‡ See, for instance, Mr. Flowers' detailed account of the extraction with his own hands of a flint implement sixteen feet below the surface at St. Acheul, near Amiens. (*Geol. Society's Journal*, vol. xvi. p. 190.) Mr. Prestwich, who was present on the occasion, says that the depth from the *original* surface was twenty-two feet.

The second and more difficult question as to the possible casual introduction of the flint weapons into the old gravel, can hardly be answered by specific disproof; and for those geologists who so long withheld their assent to M. de Perthes' conclusions this has been the stronghold of scepticism. Certainly no one would lightly admit the contemporaneity of any extraneous bodies in strata which by their very nature have been since their deposition in a mobile and comparatively incoherent state. But the evidence and the arguments which satisfied Cuvier and all contemporary geologists that the mammoth, the rhinoceros, the cave-lion, and many more extinct animals, survived to the period of the catastrophe which entombed them in these strata, applies without variation to the presence amongst these very bones of the human relics of which we are now speaking. Nor can we, without an evident paralogism, accept in the one case a conclusion which we reject in the other, merely on account of an alleged antecedent improbability. We have shown from his writings that such an improbability would not have weighed with Cuvier had the evidence which we now possess been presented to him. At the same time we desire to record that it is the *habitual* occurrence of these implements in a certain stratum which gives its main force to the evidence; and that had the discovery only been made in a few instances, or in a single locality, it might have been justly received with doubt, and judgment suspended until confirmed by repeated instances and in various places. The careful researches of Mr. Prestwich in particular, as well as of M. Rigollot and other French geologists, have given all the consistency of which this kind of evidence admits to the particular deductions of M. de Perthes in his own locality, but by extending it to others in France and to the similar formations in England, they have removed, it seems to us, any reasonable doubt that the entombment of the flint weapons corresponds exactly in point of antiquity to that of the Mammoth Age of Cuvier. But these considerations lead us naturally to a more direct consideration of the nature and age of the geological formations characterised by all these remains, especially as they occur in the valley of the Somme.

It is with the post-tertiary beds that we have here principally to do. Though they may be called in a geological sense extremely modern, they manifestly do not conform to the meaning of that phrase in a popular sense. They are subdivided by Sir C. Lyell into two groups, which admit of consistent interpretation in respect of the fossils which they contain. The older member of the post-tertiary beds (to which, as we shall see, the bone and flint implement beds of Abbeville and Amiens belong) is characterised by the fact of the shells which

it contains being all of recent species, whilst the foss. mammalia belong partly or chiefly to extinct species. This Sir C. Lyell calls *Post-Pliocene*. The upper member of the post-tertiary series, termed *Recent*, includes both shells and fossil bones belonging *entirely* to existing species. Till within a few years the last or recent period alone has been thought to include human works or remains. The question now agitated is, whether we are justified in placing the appearance of Man on the surface of the globe one stage earlier, or in the Post-Pliocene age?

That the reader may have clearly before him the relations of these upper deposits and the nomenclature actually adopted, we borrow, mainly from Sir C. Lyell's works, the following abridged view.

PERIOD.	NAME.	DESCRIPTION.	FOSSILS.
POST- TERTIARY	RECENT	Peat—deltas of rivers and alluvia generally.	Entirely of existing species. Relics of human art and of Man.
		Newest raised beaches.	
	POST- PLIOCENE	Loess of the Rhine—Terraces of the Valley of the Somme—Older raised beaches—Bone caves*	Shells all of living species, but bones of many extinct quadrupeds—Flint implements of Abbeville, &c.
TERTIARY	PLIOCENE	Boulder clay—Glacial drift or diluvium.	Include a small proportion of extinct species of shells.
	NEWER		
	OLDER	Crag of Suffolk.	Living species rarer.
	MIOCENE	(Two subdivisions)	
	EOCENE	(Three subdivisions, to London clay inclusive.)	

The gravel beds at Abbeville and at Amiens, as well as those in the valleys of the Seine and Oise, and of the valley of the Waveney, in Suffolk (near Hoxne), in all of which flint implements have been found, belong decidedly to what, in the above table, are termed the Post-Pliocene beds. Their age is determined alike by superposition and by their fossil contents. As to the former—in Suffolk, for example—they are seen to overlie the 'boulder clay,' or glacial drift, which belongs to the 'newer pliocene' formation, while they are evidently older than the peat formation contained in the valleys. With respect to fossils, they perfectly exemplify Sir C. Lyell's criteria of the post-pliocene age. The shells are, without any exception, those

\* The dates of these raised beaches and bone caves have only lately been advanced from the Boulder Clay era to the Post-pliocene period, principally on the authority of Mr. Prestwich and Dr. Falconer.

of living species; but the bones of quadrupeds, where such are found, belong usually, or almost always, to extinct species.

The evidence deducible as to the climate which prevailed at this very early stage of the history of Man is remarkable enough. The presence of bones of the elephant, rhinoceros, hippopotamus, and lion, naturally convey the idea of a nearly tropical climate. But this seemingly reasonable conclusion has been long abandoned with reference to other examples. It is not necessary that we should here recall the facts which establish that the geographical range of even existing species of most of these genera was formerly greatly underrated\*, and that the circumstances under which such remains have been found in Siberia and elsewhere conclusively show, first, that these animals (elephant and rhinoceros) lived and died on the spot — secondly, that the climate was then certainly very cold, most probably as cold as at present. Had not this been the case, these remains — which include flesh and skin as well as bones — could not possibly have been preserved, free from putrefaction, to modern times; and the woolly covering with which they were invested proves that they inhabited an arctic or sub-arctic climate. The evidence from shells, as to the climate of the drift period in the north of France, is not altogether decisive. Their species almost invariably accord with those which now belong to the same region. But, with a single exception (the *Cyrena fluminalis*, an inhabitant of the Nile), they also prevail in the northern or sub-arctic parts of Europe.† The mode of deposition of the transported sand and gravel in these beds, with the contorted forms which they present, give a colour to the idea entertained by Mr. Prestwich, as well as Sir Charles Lyell, that the winter climate of the Somme, at the early human period, was some 20° at least colder than at present; and that the habits of life of the people may have resembled those of the natives of Hudson's Bay. It may be added that, though the entire detritus which composes these important beds has been found to be strictly composed of materials comprised within the present outline of the drainage of the valley where they occur, they include massive blocks of hard tertiary sandstone, which, according to the present views of geologists, are believed by many to have required the agency of ice for their removal; another confirmation, it is thought, of the great antiquity of these deposits, and of their showing a

\* The Indian lion has been found alive in the Asiatic continent, if we recollect rightly, as far north as latitude 52°; that is, to the north of London, and in a winter climate incomparably more severe.

† Prestwich, 'Royal Society Proceedings,' 1862, p. 44; Lyell, 'Antiquity,' p. 142.

gradation in respect of climate between the modern state of things and that of the deposition of the boulder clay, a true pliocene deposit which is held to be purely marine and of an arctic character. We confess that these deductions (as regards the drift of the Somme) seem to us to rest on rather slender analogies; and we are glad that the paper in which Mr. Prestwich ingeniously considers them (*Royal Society Proceedings*, 1862) has been kept wholly distinct from his original investigation of the facts of the case (*Phil. Trans.* 1860). This last-mentioned paper appears to be a model of cautious observation and legitimate inference.

Mr. Prestwich, whose previous labours in geology had given weight to any expression of opinion connected with the pliocene and post-pliocene formations, was first induced to visit Normandy by the report of Dr. Falconer of what he had seen in M. de Perthes' museum. In 1859, Mr. Prestwich made most of the observations contained in his paper in the '*Philosophical Transactions*,' and was followed by Sir Charles Lyell, who gave in his adhesion to the views of M. de Perthes on the antiquity of Man, at the meeting of the British Association at Aberdeen, in the autumn of that year. It is only just to say that Sir C. Lyell found little to add to what his accurate predecessor, Mr. Prestwich, had done, either in confirming the genuineness of the antiquities or their precise relations to the beds in which they are found, and the geological and topographical positions of these beds. Dr. Falconer and Mr. Prestwich have thought it necessary to vindicate for themselves a more prominent position, with reference to these and other collateral discoveries, than they think Sir C. Lyell has assigned to them. But in the matter of the Abbeville antiquities, at least, we think that Sir C. Lyell really intended to give Mr. Prestwich full credit for what he had done — which, in fact, was nearly all that the case admitted of — before Sir C. Lyell had published at all on the subject. Indeed, in the '*Evidences of the Antiquity of Man*,' we do not observe a claim on the part of the author to special originality of investigation. But it is inevitable that a systematic writer, methodising for the first time a subject mainly new, and viewing it from its popular side, should obtain credit for having originated much of what he relates on the authority of his predecessors, or of which, at least, he is merely a confirmatory witness. Unfortunately, it is too common a case that such writers are even less liberal of citations from their precursors than in this case Sir Charles has been. We think we may fairly acquit him of any ungenerous intentions in the matter.

In the course of an address to the Royal Society of Edinburgh, in December 1860, the Duke of Argyll very justly observes, with reference to the question of the relics of Man in the valley of the Somme, that —

‘The reluctance to admit the contemporaneity of Man with those animals [extinct mammalia] results from the reluctance to admit Man’s priority to such physical changes as are supposed to separate us from a fauna typified by the mammoth and the elk. If therefore the fact of such priority be proved from the stratigraphical position of the flint relics, wholly independent of any argument derived from organic remains, the importance of the question of the human age of the great mammals will be much diminished.’\*

This is quite correct; and as we have dwelt chiefly on the evidence from fossils, we must just indicate the ‘Stratigraphical Evidence’ here alluded to. It is tolerably simple, and may be found in the writings and instructive sections of Mr. Prestwich and of Sir C. Lyell. We confine ourselves to the valley of the Somme.

At Amiens and Abbeville, this valley is an excavation of great width — from one to two miles — in the chalk strata covering this part of France. The height of the rising grounds adjoining the valley is about 200 feet above the level of the sea; and at Abbeville, the height above the river Somme is only a little less. The lowest part of the excavation of the chalk, or bottom of the valley, is lined with gravel, on which rests a bed of peat thirty feet thick and in part below the sea level, and through that peat the Somme makes its way. In it are found, from time to time, hatchets of a more modern character than those of the older formations called Post-Pliocene. These last beds occur in contact with the chalk slopes of the sides of the valley at two different levels above the bed of the river. One, about forty feet above the sea, occurs at the now well-known locality of Menchecourt, near Abbeville; a second terrace, from 80 to 100 feet above the sea, at Moulin Quignon. These may be called, respectively, the *low-level gravel* and *high-level gravel*. Similar phenomena occur at Amiens and elsewhere. It is to be clearly understood that these terraces are horizontally stratified masses of loam or brickearth (above), and of angular or slightly worn flint gravel (below), abutting against the slopes of chalk which form the sides of the valley; that they are abruptly cut off on the side nearest to the river, and that, according to appearances, they once stretched from side to side of the

---

\* Proceedings of the Royal Society, Edinburgh, Dec. 3rd, 1860, p. 363.

valley, like a horizontal floor, which has since been cut into and excavated by a moving power sufficient to form the modern bottom of the valley. Moreover, this process was again repeated, after an interval,—which may be assumed to have been a long one—a second and narrower floor having been formed across the valley, at the lower level, and that again cut into terraces by a fresh excavating power. Still later, the gravel and peat must have been deposited where it now fills up the lowest portion of the excavated chalk valley.

It is further to be understood that the flint implements of which we have so often spoken are found both at the 40 feet and the 80 feet terrace, in each case at the depth of 20 feet, more or less, from the modern surface, chiefly in the lower portion of the flint gravels, near where they rest on the chalk, sparingly in the brickearth or loam above, and not at all in the superficial soil which covers both, and which conforms to the sloping sides of the valley. The mammalian remains are deposited in a similar manner. It is important to add that, with the *low-level gravels* are associated some marine, as well as a preponderance of fresh-water shells, showing that, when they were deposited, the tide reached considerably above the present *mean* level of the sea at the mouth of the Somme, giving to these formations the *estuary* character; but, on the other hand, the *high-level* gravels show no trace of the presence of the ocean, nor do marine deposits extend up the valley beyond Abbeville.

On the whole, then, considerable physical changes must have occurred since these deposits of the human age occurred. Assuming the upper-level gravel to be the oldest in date, a force—apparently of water—surely very different from that which the present stream of the Somme could exert, carried along with it the flints washed out of the surrounding chalk formations, and disposed them in strata extending from side to side of the then spacious valley. Next, the stream must have cut through this deposit, and excavated\* a cavity, still wide, though somewhat narrower than before, in which, meeting the waters of the sea, it deposited the *low-level* gravel in the same manner: at this time the level of the tide must have been 15 or 20 feet higher than at present, or the land must have since been elevated so much. It appears to us to be a strong presumption that the deposition of the high and low level gravels was not

---

\* It is not necessary to assume that the solid chalk was washed out at this period. That may have been the result of older and more violent denudation, the ancient bed being afterwards filled with detritus.

separated by a vast chasm in time, that their composition, arrangement, and organic and artificial contents exhibit such a marked unity of character, the sole exception being the occurrence of marine shells in the lower beds of the lowest gravels. We say that this uniformity of character and of products seems to be a more convincing argument for the periods of deposition not being very remote from one another, than any difficulties which such a supposition involves are sufficient to counteract. We have already mentioned that the occurrence of great transported blocks of tertiary sandstone has been thought to require the introduction into these valleys of glacial agency. Might not this or some coordinate cause have aided in the formation of these terraces, and especially have given to the now puny stream which meanders through the extensive valley, a power of excavation which even the attributed aid of tens of thousands of years wholly fails to confer upon it?

Having considered at some length the most famous of the implement-bearing deposits, we will not stop to detail the particulars of others more or less similar. The discovery of fashioned flints in the valleys of the Ouse and Waveney in the East of England is chiefly interesting, *first*, as showing that their occurrence in France was not exceptional—thus removing all doubt as to the genuineness of the relics; *secondly*, as proving (what the sections in Picardy did not establish) the posteriority of these gravels to the ‘boulder clay’ or ‘glacial drift’ (a deposit of newer Pliocene age); and, *thirdly*, as having recalled to memory the fact that such discoveries had been made and recorded nearly two generations since. The flint implements found deeply imbedded in ancient gravels at Hoxne, in Suffolk, were fully described in the ‘Archæologia’ for 1800, in a paper by John Frere, Esq., read in 1797 to the Society of Antiquaries. The specimens are still preserved in the Antiquaries’ and in the British Museums. Their association with the bones of extinct animals is distinctly stated, and their date referred ‘to a very remote period, indeed even beyond that of the ‘present world;’ a conclusion as definite as any at which even in the present day we seem able to arrive. The idea of Frere that the strata were formed under the sea appears to be the only mistake; the shells indicate a fluviatile origin. It appears also from the statements at p. 161. of the ‘Antiquity of Man,’ that a flint weapon was found in 1715 near Gray’s Inn Lane, in London, associated with the remains of an elephant.

Before quitting the valley-deposits of the Somme, we must refer to the alleged discovery, since the date of Sir C. Lyell’s publication, of a fossil human jaw in the neighbourhood of



Abbeville, closely associated with characteristic flint weapons. Such an occurrence had been anxiously anticipated by M. Boucher de Perthes from the very dawn of his investigations, of which indeed it may be said to have constituted the very goal and object. Sir Charles Lyell and other geologists equally regarded it as a probable and very desirable sequel to the whole inquiry. Cuvier had long since stated that human bones are not more perishable than those of the lower animals, and Sir C. Lyell has taken pains to account for their absence by showing that in draining the Lake of Haarlem, and in other cases where such remains must certainly have existed, the chances are so multiplied against their fortuitous recovery that they are wholly undiscoverable. However, in March last, the workmen at Moulin Quignon, near Abbeville, brought to M. de Perthes a human tooth, which they declared they had found in the usual site. Having directed that special care should be taken to report to him the first appearance of further relics, on the 28th of the same month a workman named Vasseur announced that a bone projected about an inch from the matrix. This was extracted under the eyes of M. de Perthes himself, and proved to be one half of a human jaw. A flint axe was not many inches distant. The exact depth of the jaw from the surface was  $4\frac{1}{2}$  mètres, or 15 feet. The bed in which it lay was a sandy one in contact with the chalk, and dark-coloured from the admixture of iron and manganese. There were found by M. de Perthes on the same day in the yellow sand belonging to the same bed, and  $3\frac{1}{2}$  mètres from the surface, fragments of mammoths' teeth. When the discovery was published, geologists flocked to the spot both from Paris and London, especially M. de Quatrefages, professor of anthropology at the Paris Museum of Natural History, from the former, Messrs. Prestwich and Evans, Drs. Carpenter and Falconer, from the latter. The verdict given on the spot seems to have been entirely favourable to the genuineness of the relic. The jaw-bone was conveyed to Paris, and one tooth and some hatchets to London.

It appears that at the time no doubt was entertained by any of those who visited Moulin Quignon on the 14th and 15th of April that the jaw was authentically found in the locality described, and where it was seen by M. Boucher de Perthes. The Englishmen, however, moved partly by the subsequent opinion of skilled antiquaries that the hatchets were forged, as they presented no palpable proofs of antiquity, and partly by the fresh condition (when sawn open) of the interior of the single tooth in their possession, surrendered their first opinion. Dr. Falconer, in a letter to 'The Times' of April 25th, declared

that M. de Perthes had been deceived by the men. He further added that the undoubted osteological peculiarities of the jaw, which led the most skilful naturalists to consider it as bearing internal evidence of remote antiquity—in fact, of belonging to a different race of men from the European—were merely accidental, though presenting an extraordinary coincidence with the alleged circumstances of its discovery. The Parisian naturalists, however, and especially M. de Quatrefages, who had possession of the jaw, firmly adhered to the first opinion.

Under these circumstances, the controversy might have been hopelessly prolonged, had not the happy idea been entertained and acted on of holding a meeting of *savans* of both nations, which took place at Paris, under the able presidency of M. Milne-Edwards, from whence it was adjourned on the 12th of May to Abbeville. The assembly consisted of MM. Milne-Edwards, de Quatrefages, Lartet, Delesse, and Desnoyers from Paris; and Drs. Falconer and Carpenter, Messrs. Prestwich and Busk, from London. Fresh excavations were undertaken beneath the very eyes of the Commission, and were attended with the discovery of several hatchets which were believed to be genuine, though not possessing the *patina* or other proofs of antiquity formerly relied on. These results, together with a full investigation of the circumstances attending the discovery of the jaw, terminated in the conviction of every individual present at the inquiry on that occasion that no fraud had been practised.\*

The reader must not, however, suppose that with the admission

---

\* To speak rigorously, Dr. Falconer, while perfectly satisfied of the authenticity of the flint tools exhumed in the presence of the Commission on the 12th of May, and also of the jaw itself, declined to commit himself to the authenticity of the tools discovered near the jaw and on the 28th of March. Mr. Evans, who did not take part in the Conference either at Paris or Abbeville, and who therefore was not a witness to the extraction of the five 'haches' in presence of the Commission, still denies the authenticity of those not possessing the criteria of patina, dendrites, or worn edges: and it is proper to add that the strong doubts he has expressed on this subject are still entertained by many geologists of eminence. The facts stated in the text are based on documentary evidence. But we are informed that at recent meetings of the Geological Society of London more than one of the English Commissioners has seen reason to retract the opinion he formed at Abbeville. These frequent alternations of judgment have thrown doubt on the whole transaction. It is certain that many genuine remains have been found at Abbeville; but it is not less certain that many spurious objects have been introduced into the beds of gravel there.

of the relics being truly found as alleged in an undisturbed bed at the depth of fifteen feet, coincidence of opinion as to the age of the fossil was thereby attained. Dr. Falconer and Mr. Busk re-stated the doubts they originally entertained as to the absolute age of the jaw, which was now sawn across and displayed an amount of freshness inconsistent, in their opinion, with its being coeval with the remains of the extinct quadrupeds. These doubts do not seem to have been shared by the French members of the Commission; but the eminent physiologists who belonged to it, especially MM. Milne-Edwards (who as president, brought the detailed report before the Academy of Sciences on the 18th of May), and M. de Quatrefages expressly held themselves uncommitted to any opinion as to the geological age of the Moulin-Quignon beds. This reserve was the more prudent and necessary, because at the same sitting M. Elie de Beaumont, who, so far as is known to us, had hitherto studiously avoided any expression of opinion, made a statement so positive and so unexpected, as, to judge by the contemporary reports, produced an unusual and almost electric sensation on the scientific auditory. His opinion or decision was to this effect—that the Moulin-Quignon beds are not ‘diluvium;’ they are not even alluvia deposited by the encroachment of rivers on their banks; but are simply composed of washed soil deposited on the flanks of the valley by excessive falls of rain, such as may be supposed to occur exceptionally once or twice in a thousand years. A week later this eminent geologist reiterated his opinion in the same illustrious assembly, adding that the age of these formations belonged, in his opinion, to the ‘stone period,’ or is analogous to that of peat mosses and the Swiss ‘lake-habitations.’

Such is the position of the question at the moment we write. We do not think that the English geologists who have with so much industry and care established their conviction of the ‘diluvial’ or ‘post-pliocene’ age of the terraces of the Somme, will readily give in even to the justly respected authority of the veteran geologist of France. They will no doubt require him to produce ample evidence that they have been wrong, and that he is right. And we think that the scientific public will do well, while withholding a final assent to either view, not rashly to pronounce for that which relieves them from the necessity of embracing the new doctrine of the contemporaneousness of Man and the mammoth.\*

---

\* We have drawn the history of the recent proceedings at Paris and Abbeville from the French journals ‘Cosmos’ and ‘Les Mondes,’ from

The surprise which M. E. de Beaumont's verbal statement is said to have excited was perhaps greater than the occasion warranted. His doubts are the same as those which we may believe fifteen years ago caused the Academy of Sciences to turn a deaf ear to M. Boucher de Perthes' claims to have made a discovery. To that scepticism the Viscomte d'Archiac, author of an admirable compilation on the history of geology, and Mr. Mantell, well known on this side of the Channel, gave distinct expression. It was one of the first difficulties which on the re-agitation of the question in 1859, met the English visitors to the valley of the Somme, and it was we think fairly and fully met by Mr. Prestwich in his admirable paper.\* He still continues to hold that the Moulin-Quignon beds belong to the diluvium or quaternary formation.

Among the difficulties presented on the very threshold by M. Elie de Beaumont's view, is the question where to look for the true mammoth diluvium whence these remains were washed and mixed up with the relics of Man. Had flint weapons been found at one point only of the terraces of the valley of the Somme, and not at numerous and detached points, and also in distant valleys of France and England, a local disturbance might be suspected. But this, as we have seen, is not the case. Further, it is known that the fossil bones of Abbeville are not severely rubbed as if carried from a distance, and in one most remarkable instance (the more striking because it occurred long ago), M. Baillon found the bones of the hind leg of a rhinoceros so accurately in their relative positions that they must have cohered by their ligaments when interred: the entire skeleton

---

the 'Comptes Rendus,' especially those of the 18th and 25th May, from Dr. Falconer's letters to 'The Times,' of 20th and 25th April, and 21st May, and from the letters of Mr. Evans and Mr. Prestwich in the 'Athenæum.' A collateral argument urged in favour of M. Elie de Beaumont's views, derived from the absence of ivory ornaments in association with the worked flints, which it is argued must have been abundant had the aborigines been contemporary with the mammoth, seems to us, as being merely *negative* evidence, to be undeserving of great weight in the face of positive arguments of an opposite kind. Dr. Buckland found a quantity of ivory rods and rings associated with human female bones in the cave of Paviland in Wales (to which we shall have again to refer), yet he did not conclude (as with much better reason he might have done) that the woman in question was contemporary with the elephants whose remains lay near her.\* However, we feel quite entitled to use this positive fact against the negative one of the French antiquaries.

\* Phil. Trans., 1860, p. 300, 301.

was also at no great distance.\* The horizontal terrace-like stratification of the bone-bearing beds and their uniform character apparently extending over great distances, as shown in the sections of Mr. Prestwich and Sir C. Lyell, are also in opposition to the views of M. Elie de Beaumont.

We now come to the class of evidences of human antiquity most nearly allied to the preceding, arising from the occurrences of flint weapons, and also of human bones associated in a more or less unequivocal way with relics of extinct animals in limestone caverns.

The difficulties which have always beset this investigation, or rather the uncertainty to which the conclusions are liable, place the results decidedly one degree lower in the scale of proof than in the case of the stratified post-pliocene deposits which we have been discussing. Instead of having an orderly succession of deposits occurring in a uniform manner over considerable areas, and capable of excavation to an unlimited extent, we have in the bone-mud of caves entirely local and, so to speak, accidental accretions, disconnected with ordinary geological causes and devoid of position in the recognised strata of the globe. These caves have in many instances remained accessible for ages after the mud deposits were made, or may have even served for occasional concealment or shelter down to modern times. At all events, they were tenanted for long periods by successive races whether of animals or men, and the record of their antiquity was not, as in the case of strata geologically superimposed, sealed up and verified by a succession of later deposits.

It is quite impossible for us to enter upon the difficulties which beset the interpretation of the well-established association of the remains of such extinct animals as the elephant, rhinoceros, the cave-bear, hyæna, and lion, and of the reindeer with human bones, and especially with stone implements. Dr. Buckland, to whom Cuvier acknowledged himself to be deeply indebted for light thrown on these problematical deposits, disbelieved the contemporaneousness of the relics of Man and those of the lower animals. This was not merely Buckland's opinion in 1823 when he wrote his '*Reliquiæ Diluvianæ*,' but also when he published the second edition of his *Bridgewater Treatise* in 1837†; and it remained probably

---

\* See extract from M. Baillon's paper of 1834-5, quoted by Mr. Prestwich in '*Philosophical Transactions*,' 1860, p. 313.

† Supplementary Notes, p. 602., where the researches of Schmerling in the Belgian caves are referred to.

unchanged to the close of his life. Sir Charles Lyell allowed also to these difficulties their full force. He says in an early edition of his 'Principles,' (after enumerating the sources of confusion in classifying cave deposits), 'It is not on such evidence that we shall readily be induced to admit either the high antiquity of the human race, or the recent date of certain lost species of quadrupeds.\*' His views, indeed, remained unchanged down to the date of the last edition of the 'Principles,' as he candidly allows in the following passage of the 'Antiquity of Man,' where he also mentions the occasion of his altering it:—

'I came to the opinion that the human bones mixed with those of extinct animals in osseous breccias and cavern mud were probably not coeval. The caverns having been at one period the dens of wild beasts, and having served at other times as places of human habitation, worship, sepulture, concealment, or defence, one might easily conceive that the bones of man and those of animals which were strewn over the floors of subterranean cavities, or which had fallen into tortuous rents connecting them with the surface, might, when swept away by floods, be mingled in one promiscuous heap in the same ossiferous mud or breccia. . . . But of late years we have obtained convincing proofs . . . that the mammoth and many other extinct mammalian species very common in caves occur also in undisturbed alluvium, embedded in such a manner with works of art, as to leave no room for doubt that Man and the mammoth coexisted. Such discoveries have led me and other geologists to reconsider the evidence previously derived from caves brought forward in proof of the high antiquity of Man.' (Lyell, p. 62.)

The most critical fact which seems to have influenced Sir C. Lyell as well as many other geologists, was observed in the course of an excavation of the previously unexplored cave of Brixham in Devonshire, in 1858 or 1859, under the direction and personal superintendence of Dr. Falconer and Mr. Pengelly. Many flint knives were obtained from the lower part of a bed of 'bone-earth' often of great thickness, which occupied the chambers of the cavern. Above the bone-earth was a layer of stalagmite (calcareous deposition) which for ages has sealed up and secured from the air or from casual intrusion the beds below it. This stalagmite covered the entire humerus of a cave-bear (*Ursus spelæus*, an extinct species). Moreover, 'in the bone-bed and in close proximity to a very perfect flint tool' lay the entire left hind leg of a cave-bear. Every bone of it was recovered, down even to the patella: intimating that when entombed along with the flint implement, these bones had not

---

\* Principles, vol. ii. p. 233 (ed. 1833).

been washed out of an older deposit, but were probably clothed with flesh, or 'at least had the separate bones bound together 'with their natural ligaments' (*Lyell*, p. 101.). It seems difficult to resist so reasonable a conclusion, and though it is plain that the man and the bear could not have lived in the cave together, it may be that they disputed its occupation, or that the ursine remains were washed in after the cave was deserted by man. No human bones have, we believe, been found in the Brixham cave.

After citing this, perhaps the latest, best established, and most satisfactory of the arguments as to human antiquity yet derived from cave evidences, we will not stop to inquire whether Professor Schmerling of Liège in 1833, and Mr. M'Enery of Torquay about the same period, had not already arrived with equal right at the same conclusions long before, which the former at least had confidently but vainly announced to an unbelieving generation. We now acknowledge that they were in all probability justified in their conclusions. Yet these were difficult to establish, and isolated facts must ever be regarded by geologists with the utmost distrust, especially when they are of a nature to disappear from subsequent verification. The evidences of the integrity and superposition of cave deposits, and of the exact conditions of association of the remains, are of so fleeting and so nice a description, as to demand the most circumspect caution in accepting them. Mere reports of workmen avail nothing here. It is on the personal testimony of the explorers of the Brixham cave alone, that we are inclined to accept their important conclusions.

In truth, it is difficult to dispense with ocular proof in such cases; and, failing that evidence, we fall back upon concurrent testimony from many impartial quarters. It was the independent proof from the valleys of Picardy of the association of implements with extinct mammalia, which gave Sir C. Lyell confidence in accepting the results of the Brixham explorations; and, precisely conversely, it was the personal conviction which he acquired at Brixham which induced Dr. Falconer to revisit in 1858 the Abbeville museum, and there find proofs of the same facts, which he seems in 1856 to have seen unconvinced. All this is natural and reasonable. It is the normal progress of science towards the admission of truth by the progressive elimination of legitimate doubts. It may be compared to the hesitation with which the extra-terrestrial origin of meteoric stones was at first received.

Until recently it has been very generally held that the age of bone-cave deposits coincided with, or preceded, that of the 'boulder clay,' making them more ancient therefore than the

flint beds of the Somme and Ouse. But at that time the true age of those beds had not been clearly ascertained, and the fossils which they contain were assumed to belong to the newer Pliocene series. It appears that the researches of Dr. Falconer, in connexion particularly with the varieties of the extinct elephant, have gone far to establish that the bone caves are of the same geological era with those post-pliocene deposits. Granting this, we are met with difficulties in making even a remote approximation to the chronological antiquity of cavern deposits. These difficulties are the same in kind, and almost greater in degree, than those which we met with in contemplating the vast energies which must have been expended in excavating the valley of the Somme in the cases of Amiens and Abbeville. The situation of the limestone caverns is in a great number of cases most remarkable. They open upon inaccessible, or nearly inaccessible, precipices. The expressive sections in Dr. Buckland's '*Reliquiæ Diluvianæ*' give us a lively conviction of the difficulty of accounting for how animals entered these dens, and how they were afterwards subjected to alluvial processes. We are assured that in many cases no alternative remains but to suppose that the configuration of the country has altered since those times, and that cliffs, now sixty feet high, must have been formed at Brixham since the time when floods found access to the caves. In the valley of the Meuse, the cliffs upon which the caves open are said to be two hundred feet in vertical height. The difficulty of accounting for such changes by any conceivable duration of existing causes, startles even Sir Charles Lyell from his uniformitarian tranquillity. After stating the last-mentioned fact, he adds:—

‘There appears also in many cases to be such a correspondence in the openings of caverns on opposite sides of some of the valleys, both large and small, as to incline one to suspect that they originally belonged to a series of tunnels and galleries which were continuous before the present system of drainage came into play, or before the existing valleys were scooped out. Other signs of subsequent fluctuation are afforded by gravel containing elephant's bones at slight elevations above the Meuse and several of its tributaries. The loess also in the suburbs and neighbourhood of Liège, occurring at various heights in patches lying at between 20 and 200 feet above the river, cannot be explained without supposing the filling up and re-excavation of the valleys at a period posterior to the washing in of the animal remains into most of the old caverns. It may be objected that, according to the present rate of change, no lapse of ages would suffice to bring about such revolutions in physical geography as we are here contemplating. *This may be true. It is more than probable that the rate of change was once far more active than it is now.*’ (*Antiquity of Man*, p. 73, 74.)



It is almost unnecessary to insist on the fact that the last sentence annihilates the argument for excessive antiquity—in fact, puts the claimant out of court. There can be no calculation of secular change when violent catastrophes are invoked for the division of the Gordian knot. The case reminds us of the practice of those homœopathic professors who, whilst no crisis threatens, continue to administer with firm composure trillionths of a grain to their trusting patient; but when emergencies occur, lose confidence in their globules, and resort with precipitation to the vigorous remedies of the orthodox physician.

Before quitting this part of the subject, there are two discoveries in connexion with bone caves which we cannot wholly pass over, since Sir C. Lyell gives them each a prominent place; namely, the skulls of Engis and Neanderthal, and the sepulchre of Aurignac.

Amongst the human relics detected many years ago by Schmerling in the Belgian caves, we ought perhaps to have mentioned sooner that flint implements were so abundant as to have excited comparatively little attention, whilst the bones of Man were rare. Of the latter, we believe that but one skull has been preserved, that of the Engis cave. More lately (in 1857), a skull was found in the cavern of the Neanderthal, near Dusseldorff\*, whose peculiarity of form, rather than the geological proofs of its great antiquity, has attracted to it much notice. Sir C. Lyell has devoted more than an entire chapter to the description of these remains, regarded chiefly from an anatomical point of view. It is, in fact, an episode in the treatment of his subject, and belongs rather to the concluding portion of the volume on Darwin's 'Theory of the Origin of Species,' than to the geological argument of the 'Antiquity of Man.' Sir C. Lyell relies on the authority of Mr. Huxley in the purely anthropological discussion. A reader unacquainted with the author's predilection for the Darwinian hypothesis might be rather puzzled to account for the insertion in this place of the chapter on the form of these old skulls. But he who knows already the conclusion—which may almost be called a *foregone* conclusion—in the writer's mind, is struck, on the other hand, with the failure in establishing the desired proof which is the tendency of the whole inquiry. It is a curious instance of the struggle, which we often meet with in Sir C. Lyell's very agreeable writings, between the intensity of his prepossessions and the natural candour which is continually making itself seen.

There is little or no dispute about the facts. Of the two

skulls that of Engis is the more certainly ancient. It was found associated with the bones of the rhinoceros; though, as we have already observed, this alone is in caves no sure evidence of contemporaneousness. The skull from Neanderthal might apparently be of almost any date, so far as its geological position is concerned. It was carelessly extricated by workmen from the cavern mud, along with other parts of a skeleton which were not recognised as human until after several weeks.\* The skull is admitted to be of a very low type of humanity, resembling in some degree the Australian races, yet in cubical capacity it is far superior to certain modern skulls, and has more than double that of the highest order of monkey. Its form is no doubt very strange (surely the *shading* in the figure, p. 82., of the 'Antiquity of Man,' must give an unintentional exaggeration of the superciliary ridge!). The Engis skull, on the other hand, presents no anomaly of great moment, and is readily referred by anatomists to the ordinary European race.† It appears, therefore, to be a somewhat unreasonable prepossession to *wish* to maintain (for we can hardly affirm that Sir C. Lyell directly maintains it), that the less certainly ancient skull is any proof of the gradation of Man into the ape, while the more certainly ancient one in the same district contradicts such an inference. At page 92., Sir C. Lyell puts his argument in a form hardly logical. It seems to amount to this. This skull (of Neanderthal) may either be very ancient or not very ancient. If very ancient, it was a *normal* skull of the period when Man was nearer the ape than at present; if not very ancient, it was an *abnormal* skull of that period simulating a return (called 'atavism') to the structure of the owner's monkey-like progenitors. Thus, whether normal or abnormal, it is to be quoted on Mr. Darwin's side. In other passages, however, Sir C. Lyell, and also his anatomical guide, Professor Huxley, are fairer in their conclusions. On the geological antiquity of the Neanderthal skull, the former says (p. 78.): —

'I think it probable that this fossil may be of about the same age as those found by Schmerling in the Liège caverns; but, as no other animal remains were found with it, there is no proof that it may not be newer. *Its position lends no countenance whatever to the supposition of its being more ancient.*'

---

\* Schaaffhausen in 'Natural History Review,' i. 156†

† Professor Huxley elsewhere describes it as 'a fair average human skull, which might have belonged to a philosopher, or might have contained the thoughtless brains of a savage.' (*Man's Place in Nature*, p. 156.)

Professor Huxley says:—

‘The fact that the skulls of one of the purest and most homogeneous of existing races of men can be proved to differ from one another in the same characters, though perhaps not quite to the same extent as the Engis and Neanderthal skulls, seems to me to prohibit any cautious reasoner from affirming the latter to have been necessarily of distinct races.’ (*Lyell*, pp. 88, 89.)

And again,—

‘The comparatively large cranial capacity of the Neanderthal skull, overlaid though it may be by pithecoïd [ape-like] bony walls, and the completely human proportions of the accompanying limb-bones, together with the very fair developement of the Engis skull, clearly indicate that the first traces of the primordial stock whence Man has proceeded need no longer be sought, by those who entertain any form of the doctrine of progressive developement, in the newest tertiaries, but that they may be looked for in an epoch more distant from the age of the *Elephas primigenius* than that is from us.’\* (*Antiquity of Man*, p. 89.)

Sir C. Lyell, in his *resumé* of his arguments on the antiquity of Man, in chapter xix., gives the following conclusions on the subject of these skulls, which it will be seen are in conformity with Mr. Huxley’s, and betray none of the leaning to the Darwinian inference which we have already abridged from his fifth chapter:—

‘The human skeletons of the Belgian caverns, of times coeval with the mammoth and other extinct mammalia, do not betray any signs of a marked departure in their structure, whether of skull or limb, from the modern standard of certain living races of the human family. As to the remarkable Neanderthal skeleton, it is at present too isolated and exceptional, and its age too uncertain, to warrant us in relying on its abnormal and ape-like characters, as bearing on the question whether the farther back we trace Man into the past, the more we shall find him approach in bodily conformation to those species of the anthropoid quadrumana which are most akin to him in structure.’ (P. 375.)

The prominent place given in the ‘*Antiquity of Man*’ to

---

\* In his work on ‘*Man’s Place in Nature*,’ Professor Huxley says, with equal candour: ‘In no sense then can the Neanderthal bones be regarded as the remains of a being intermediate between men and apes. At most they demonstrate the existence of a man’ [observe, not of a race of men] ‘whose skull may be said to revert somewhat to the pithecoïd type.’ And again, ‘The fossil remains of Man hitherto discovered do not seem to me to take us appreciably nearer to that lower pithecoïd form by the modification of which he has probably become what he is.’ (*Man’s Place in Nature*, pp. 157–159.)

this cranial discussion closes, therefore, in an absolute negation of evidence as to the points which the author evidently wished to establish. It was fitting and right that the anatomical inquiries should be vigorously pursued, but as they have ended in no result, so far as the argument of Sir C. Lyell is concerned, we should have preferred seeing them less prominently brought forward than has been done, as if some weighty conclusion was to result from them.

The other question regarding the burial-place of Aurignac demands also a brief notice.

Of the many interesting statements and discoveries included in the descriptive pages of Sir C. Lyell's work, none appears more *piquant* to curiosity, or more suggestive of speculation, than those respecting the sepulchral cave of Aurignac, situated in the department of the Haute Garonne, on one of the spurs of the Pyrenees, some forty-five miles south-west from Toulouse. All the extant details of this most ancient of recognised places of sepulture we owe to M. Lartet, a French palæontologist of recognised character and ability; but very unfortunately he was a personal witness to only a portion of the facts. We have not room to detail the particulars, important though they are in drawing any conclusion from the narrative. For them we must refer to M. Lartet's paper in the fifteenth volume of the '*Annales des Sciences Naturelles*,' or a full translation in the first volume of the '*Natural History Review*.' A very clear and faithful abstract is given in the '*Antiquity of Man*,' pp. 181-193. The cave was accidentally discovered in 1852 by a workman, in the face of a limestone hill, at an inconsiderable height above the brook Rodes. The entrance was entirely concealed by a talus of natural débris; and the cave-proper was effectually closed by a vertical slab of stone, which was removed by the discoverer Bonnemaïson (a labourer), but subsequently broken up and lost. It was not till 1860 that the circumstances of the discovery were investigated by M. Lartet. Within the stone barrier just mentioned, at the time when it was opened, lay relics of seventeen individuals, which were counted by the Maire of Aurignac, a medical man, and by his order entombed in the church-yard. The made ground constituting the soil of the cave was, however, then left untouched. It was first excavated, eight years after its discovery, under M. Lartet's personal inspection. More human bones were found, tools of flint and bone, the greater part of the skeleton of a cave-bear, teeth of the cave-lion and wild boar, and numerous bones of the rhinoceros, and other extinct, and of some recent graminivorous, animals.

Exterior to the stone door a similar deposit was found, with the peculiarity that marks of fire were abundant underneath, and that the bones (amongst which those of the carnivora were less frequent than within the cave) were almost invariably split open in the manner which savages use to do for the extraction of the marrow. Since undergoing this process they had evidently been gnawed by the teeth of animals, probably hyænas, from the marks of which the bones within the cavern were *entirely free*. On the whole evidence M. Lartet and also Sir C. Lyell arrive at conclusions which may be thus summed up: 1. The chamber in the rock (a natural cavity) was unquestionably a place of sepulture used when Man was contemporary with the great cave-bear, cave-lion, rhinoceros, &c. 2. The implements of flint found in the cave resemble those of the terraces of the valley of the Somme, but are (we infer) somewhat more carefully formed. The tools and weapons in bone and horn (both of roe and reindeer) resemble those found in so-called 'Recent' deposits of the stone age, and are well preserved. 3. The remains of beasts were (most probably) introduced within the cave *by design*; either as spoils of the chase in honour of the deceased, or as a *viaticum* for his passage into another state. The weapons were introduced for a similar purpose. Both these usages are in conformity with the known habits of rude nations in all parts of the globe. 4. The external area in front of the stone door was no doubt the scene of feasts succeeding the funerals, and includes not a single human bone. No trace of fire or of the teeth-marks of wild animals are found *within* the chamber, and there also the bones are not split up for the marrow. 5. According to M. Lartet the evidence from fossils gives to this tomb an antiquity at least as great as (if not greater than) that of the Amiens and Abbeville deposits.\*

---

\* There are many analogous features in the Cave of Aurignac and that of Paviland in South Wales, described long since by Dr. Buckland. (*Reliq. Diluv.* pp. 82-98.) The female skeleton found in the latter, accompanied by numerous ivory rods and rings, and a skewer of wolf-bone, was associated with the bones of extinct animals of species almost exactly coinciding with those of Aurignac, also with ashes and apparent culinary remains. All these things, as well as the general position of the cave on the sea-shore, seem to point to a somewhat similar antiquity. No doubt Dr. Buckland refused to entertain the idea of the contemporaneity of the human with the elephantine remains, but he gives no convincing proof to the contrary. The remains at Paviland appear, however, to have been previously disturbed.

Sir Charles Lyell gives an apt citation from a ballad of Schiller, translated by Bulwer, describing the funeral rites of North American Indians in terms which correspond closely with the phenomena of Aurignac. We are sorry not to make room for the lines, but quote some concluding remarks of our author in a tone of sentiment which his writings rarely display :—

‘The Aurignac cave adds no new species to the list of extinct quadrupeds which we have elsewhere and by independent evidence ascertained to have *once* flourished contemporaneously with Man. But if the fossil memorials have been correctly interpreted — if we have here before us at the northern base of the Pyrenees a sepulchral vault, with skeletons of human beings, consigned by friends and relatives to their last resting-place — if we have also at the portal of the tomb the relics of funeral feasts, and within it indications of viands destined for the use of the departed on their way to the land of spirits ; while among the funeral gifts are weapons wherewith in other fields to chase the gigantic deer, the cave-lion, cave-bear, and woolly rhinoceros — we have at last succeeded in tracing back the sacred rites of burial, and, more interesting still, a belief in a future state, to times long anterior to those of history and tradition.’ (Lyell, pp. 192, 193.)

Assuming all the conclusions from the observations of M. Lartet to be correct (and from the great majority of them we see no cause to dissent), it appears to be almost incontestable that the result is unfavourable to the idea of assigning an almost measureless antiquity to those numerous deposits which are proved to be coeval with extinct mammalia, and of which we have treated in this article. It goes a long way to convince us that the existence in Europe of the cave-bear, cave-lion, rhinoceros, and mammoth must be approximated much more towards recent times, rather than that the creation of Man must be drawn back into a region of quite hypothetical remoteness, on account of his association with extinct species. But Sir C. Lyell and M. Lartet (who appears to be a thorough disciple of his school) try to persuade us that absence of any mark of important change in the physical condition of the surface of the country about Aurignac, is no proof that the antiquity of the tomb may not be indefinitely great. Great no doubt it must be : but every fact connected with its position and discovery seems to show that it belongs to what we may (somewhat vaguely, no doubt) call the *present age of the world*. There is nothing unreasonable in assuming that these mammals survived to a later period of the world’s history than geologists have usually allowed. Even the evidence of change of climate which they were once considered to establish

has disappeared as a difficulty. In a word, it seems to us to be repugnant to all rules of probable inference, to suppose that we have before us intact relics of sepultures which occurred *tens of thousands of years ago*.

The length to which this article has already extended, warns us to abridge within the shortest compass the consideration of the evidence adduced by Sir Charles Lyell for the antiquity of Man in connexion with volcanic deposits, and with 'Recent' formations, especially the deltas and other mud deposits of rivers.

In 1828, our countryman, Dr. Hibbert, had the merit of discovering near Langeac the first fossil bones connected with the volcanic formations of Central France, and unquestionably antecedent to the latest eruptions of that wonderful country.\* They belonged to animals of the class of rhinoceros, hyæna, and cervus, probably coincident with those of the post-pliocene period. Later, the number of these remains has been greatly increased.† In 1844, at the Montagne de Denise, quite near to the town of Le Puy, remains of two human beings were found, including a skull in tufa, believed by many geologists to be of the same age with the last basaltic eruption of that volcano. The genuineness of these remains has been very thoroughly investigated by Messrs. Scrope, Pictet, Lartet, Sir C. Lyell, and others. It seems quite reasonable to believe that the specimens originally found were genuine, whatever may be the case with some alleged to have been discovered since the notoriety of the first specimens became general. The certainty of their anteriority to the last basaltic outbreak of the Mont Denise is, however, questioned by some geologists. Admitting that the fact is so, it confirms the testimony of the Abbeville beds as to the age of Man, and was so accepted whilst the researches of M. Boucher de Perthes were comparatively unknown or discredited. Such a discovery can hardly surprise those who have visited the volcanoes of Auvergne and the Vivarais. The wonder has always been that of phenomena so apparently recent and stupendous, no record or even tradition should have reached modern times.

We need hardly dwell upon the fossil man of Natchez, nor upon some others referred to in Sir Charles Lyell's eleventh and sixteenth chapters. These human remains were found in a clayey deposit which *appeared* to have fallen from old alluvial cliffs of

\* Edinburgh Journal of Science, 1830. New series, ii. 276.

† Scrope's 'Volcanoes of Central France;' edition of 1858, p. 223, &c.

great height adjoining the modern delta of the Mississippi, and, as Sir C. Lyell believes, more ancient than it. It is needless to go into the proofs of the exact geological position of the human bones, of which no one was really a witness; and the determination appeared to Sir C. Lyell in 1846, when he saw the specimen in a collection, to be so unsatisfactory, that after investigating the circumstances on the spot, he thought it quite possible that it might have 'been dislodged out of some old 'Indian grave,' near the top of the cliff in question, and had fallen to its base, though he also gives the alternative of assigning to it the same antiquity as the remains of the *Mastodon* occurring in the lower beds of this old alluvium.\* In the latter case, Sir C. Lyell infers that it ought to be considered as of an age anterior to the formation of the entire modern delta of the Mississippi, a mud deposit of great thickness, and extending over 12,000 to 14,000 square miles. He supposes (both in his earlier and later writings) that this deposit may have required 100,000 years for its formation.

The age of deltas (those of the Nile, the Po, and the Ganges, for example) has been a matter of speculation, not only since phenomenal geology became a science, but even as far back as the days of Herodotus. That shrewd though often credulous historian ascribed the delta of the Nile to its true cause, the deposit of river mud; and went so far as to estimate that it would suffice in from 10,000 to 20,000 years to fill up the Erythrean Sea. But during the last sixty or eighty years, since the period of Deluc, Dolomieu, and Hutton, the accumulation of data on this subject has been very considerable, although, perhaps, little certainty has been given to the attempts to affix a chronological value to the progress or age of these deposits. The results, it may be briefly said, vary so widely as to prevent us from placing great reliance on any of the estimates. We have the high authorities of Playfair and Lyell, on the side of almost indefinite antiquity, to set against the more moderate estimates of not less eminent naturalists, such as Dolomieu, Cuvier, and Elie de Beaumont. The three last-named authors have emphatically given it as their opinion, that, so far as may be reasonably judged from the rate of encroachment of river deltas into the sea, and especially from the well-known instances of the Po, the Nile, and the Mississippi, the period when they began to transgress the natural pre-existing margin of the coast is to be reckoned at a few thousand years only. The evidence has been discussed

---

\* See 'Lyell's Second Visit to the United States,' ii. 197.



with great fulness and ingenuity, and from the best sources of information then extant, by M. Elie de Beaumont, in his unfinished and too little known work, '*Leçons de Géologie Pratique.*' He arrives distinctly and decisively at the general result which we have just noted as to the age of river alluvia, and also of that of downs of moving sand thrown up on many coasts, which he considers to give coincident evidence on this point. Misled, we believe, by an erroneous measurement (350 mètres) of the present annual growth of the delta of the 'Mississippi, he deduces a period for its growth so short (1,300 years) as manifestly to show (as M. de Beaumont himself remarks) that little dependence can be placed in any estimate involving the *uniform* progress and great periods of time of such changes. According to the latest observers the advance of the principal mouths of that great river towards the ocean is not more than a fourth of that above stated.\* This allowance would give a period of growth for the delta of between 5,000 and 6,000 years. The prodigious contrast of the estimate even when thus enlarged, with the 100,000 years of Sir C. Lyell, illustrates the caution with which such calculations are to be received.

Intimately connected with this subject, and liable to even greater uncertainties, are the calculations by Mr. Horner as to the age of the alluvial deposits of the banks of the Nile, which have covered more or less many ancient buildings, and in which at great depths certain works of man, particularly pottery, are said to have been disinterred.† This occurred, it is stated, at

---

\* See Dana's '*Manual of Geology*' (1863), p. 647. This work contains the latest measurements of the enlargement of the delta, and of the amount of solid matter carried down by the Mississippi *annually* into the Gulf of Mexico. The latter is estimated to be equivalent to a cake of solid matter a mile square and 268 feet thick. This includes what the river carries in suspension, and also what it pushes before it. The amount is between three and four times greater than it was estimated by Sir C. Lyell ('*Second Visit*,' ii. 260.), and consequently *diminishes* the alleged antiquity of the delta in the same proportion.

† '*Philosophical Transactions*' for 1855 and 1858. In the instance principally dwelt on by Mr. Horner as the best authenticated, a fragment of pottery was brought by the boring implements of the Egyptian engineers from a depth of 39 feet; so that allowing the accumulation of Nile mud to have been effected at the rate of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  inches per century (which is Mr. Horner's estimate), this fragment is presumed by him to be a record of the existence of Man 13,371 years before A.D. 1854, or 11,517 years before the Christian era. (*Philosophical Transactions*, 1858, p. 57.)

depths of even sixty and seventy feet, indicating an antiquity of at least twice as many centuries, on the allowance (which Mr. Horner considers to be much too liberal) of six inches of deposit per century. Very serious doubts have been thrown upon these calculations: as, for example, from the uncertainty of the alleged works of art having really been found at those depths, their excavation having been witnessed by no European; from the hesitation of antiquaries to admit that burnt brick or pottery was employed in any circumstances under the old Egyptian dynasties; from the anomalies which occur in the beds of all rivers from frequent changes in their course, and the filling up of some channels and opening of new ones; and from the great uncertainty universally admitted to prevail in the estimates of the Nilotic accumulations within distinctly historic times. But we are absolved from the task of analysing these considerations by the frank avowal of Sir Charles Lyell (*'Antiq. of Man,'* p. 38.), that 'the experiments instituted by Mr. Horner, in the hope of obtaining an accurate chronometric scale for testing the age of a given thickness of Nile sediment, are not considered by experienced Egyptologists to have been satisfactory.'

The consideration of 'deltas and river deposits brings us to the period strictly called 'Recent,' in which all geologists have allowed that relics of Man are frequently found, though even here comparatively rarely, in the form of bones or skeletons. To such relics peculiar interest attaches, and will more and more continue to attach, as it serves to connect the geological or unrecorded history of the globe with its strictly *human* and in part recorded history.

The technical distinction of deposits belonging to geological and historical periods of time has, we have seen, been held to be, that in the last no remains of extinct species of animals are found. The mammals, as well as the shell-fish, are those of our own age of the world. Into this wide and interesting field it is quite impossible that we should here enter. As treated by Sir Charles Lyell, it includes two chief classes of facts—those connected with modern 'raised beaches' undoubtedly marine, and those connected with lake deposits, peat mosses, and the like, as well as all casually interred traces of Man, evidently anterior to the period of recorded history. Each of these classes of facts furnishes our author with a species of chronology based on the principle of 'uniformity,' and subject to all the doubts and difficulties of that hazardous principle of computation.

The raised beaches, or marine terraces, or sea margins denoting the former presence of the ocean, at levels relative more or less

above the present one, belong to widely different periods, all, however, included within the extensive limits of Newer Pliocene, Post-Pliocene, and Recent deposits: to the first belong the marine part of the boulder clays of Scotland and the South-East of England; to the second, the lower flint implement beds of the Somme, and probably many of the marine deposits both of Scotland and Scandinavia; to the last, the 'twenty-five feet,' and possibly the 'forty feet' terraces of Scotland, and the lower marine beds of Sweden. The old coast-lines under the second and third head are now well known from the accurate description of Sir C. Lyell (for Sweden), and of Mr. Smith of Jordan Hill\*, the late Mr. Bald and Professor Edward Forbes, of Mr. Chambers, Mr. Geikie, and many others (for Scotland). They are in many instances shown to be coeval, not only with Man, but with Man advanced beyond the ruder or savage stage, including relics of the 'bronze' or even the 'iron' period. The most frequent and notable relics of the less elevated beaches are canoes, usually cut out of the solid, of which, as an instance, no less than seventeen have been found within the last eighty years on the site of the city of Glasgow. (*Lyell*, p. 48.) These canoes give evidence of having been formed by tools of metal.† Opinion is divided as to whether this latest sojourn of the sea at a higher level can be traced to within the period of written history. Mr. Geikie and Sir Charles Lyell incline to the opinion that the last rise has partly or chiefly occurred by a gradual elevation since the Roman occupation of Britain; and relying on this somewhat contestable *datum*, Sir C. Lyell ('*Antiq. of Man*,' p. 55.) attempts to establish a chronometric scale amounting to about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  foot of rise in a century; and forthwith applies it to assign the age of a rude ornament of cannel coal, described by Mr. Smith as found 50 feet above the sea associated with marine shells. This by an easy piece of arithmetic he finds to be 3,400 years old, or contemporary with the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt. No doubt Sir C. Lyell excuses himself from being committed to this estimate

---

\* To Mr. Smith belongs the merit of pointing out the partially Arctic character of a considerable per-centage of the shells found in the raised beaches. Though all of existing species, many must be sought for as living in high latitudes. This deduction was the more interesting because it preceded the geological development of the Glacial theory, with which it remarkably harmonizes. Mr. Smith has collected in a small work his papers on this subject. (*Researches in Newer Pliocene and Post-Tertiary Geology*, 1862.)

† See also Wilson's '*Prehistoric Man*,' vol. i., and Chambers' '*Sea Margins*,' p. 203., &c.

of age by the following immediately succeeding paragraph (*Antiquity*, p. 55.):—‘But all such estimates must be considered, in the present state of science, as tentative and conjectural, since the rate of movement of the land may not have been uniform, and its direction not always upwards; and there may have been long stationary periods, one of which, of more than usual duration, seems indicated by the 40-foot raised beach, which has been traced for vast distances along the western coast of Scotland.’ But if the argument be thus worthless, to adduce it at all seems to be not only unnecessary but calculated to mislead. Besides, the alleged rise of the coast since the time of the Romans, upon which the chronometric scale is based, is seriously entertained by few geologists.

Here we must enter a firm but respectful protest against this the most favourite of all Sir Charles Lyell’s scales of geological time-- a specific rate of the elevation of continents, doubtless going on at present in *some* cases, but assumed to have regulated in all, or many other cases, the process of the emergence of land from the deep, and applied to the evaluation of almost indefinite ages of past geological change of level.

We cannot state how often in the present and in former writings of Sir Charles Lyell we find the particular amount of rise of continents *at the rate of two and a half feet in a century*, assumed as a basis of calculation of the age of marine deposits lodged at different levels over existing continents. It is expressly based on his own investigations, and those of his predecessors, on the rise during historic times of the Scandinavian peninsula, of which the results are to be found in the ‘Philosophical Transactions’ for 1835, and in the ‘Principles of Geology.’\* As a sort of average from data by no means certain or consistent, he adopts three feet for the secular rise of Norway and Sweden *as a whole*. But admitting this average, it appears to afford not even the slightest clue to the laws of subterraneous energy acting at other epochs, and in remote parts of the globe. When, therefore, we find Sir C. Lyell applying his Scandinavian chronometer to the age of the most ancient alluvial deposits of the Mississippi†, to raised beaches in Sardinia, including pottery (to which on this ground only the author assigns an antiquity of 12,000 years)‡, to the possible obliteration of Behring’s Straits by elevation§, as well as attri-

\* Ninth edition, p. 519.

† Second Visit to the United States, ii. 259, 268.

‡ Antiquity of Man, p. 178.

§ *Ibid.*, p. 368.

buting an antiquity of 24,000 years to the post-tertiary strata of Norway\*, we feel bound to say that the author is giving a numerical value to periods of time calculated upon vague and inapplicable analogies. For amongst other objections to these estimates, it is evident, (1.) that the phenomenon of the changing level of the Baltic has now for a century and a half attracted attention as an *exceptional* fact, and not as the normal condition of the surface of the globe, or of even any one of its continents; (2.) that in some localities subsidence of the land seems to be the well established law of actual change, as on the Italian shore of the Adriatic, at Disco in Greenland, and in the case of some of the Coral Islands of the Pacific; (3.) that, according to Sir C. Lyell himself, the measure of rise even within the limits of Scandinavia varies from five feet per century at the North Cape, to *zero* to the south of Stockholm; and in the extreme south of Sweden it becomes *negative*, for there the land has been sinking for at least 800 years. The movement is, therefore, rather one of *tilting* than of simple vertical change. (4.) In Sweden, in Scotland, and we may add generally, we have no ground for asserting that it has been uniform even in historic times; while we are certain from geological evidence, that in remote times the movement of the land was interrupted by long periods, which are marked by the formation of terraces and beaches, and by successive submersions and elevations of land, such as geologists have traced along the coast of Norfolk, the mouth of the Somme, and in many other places. (5.) Even could we venture to assume that one prevalent cause is at this period of our globe's existence elevating the land of continents uniformly, and in all directions suffering the sea to subside into its bed (which is contradicted by history and analogy), it would be most illogical to apply the same chronometric scale to long past periods of the earth's unknown history. The longer we make the periods, in conformity with the Lyellian doctrines, the more does the excessive improbability of such an assumption appear. To carry back arithmetically the deductions of 100 or 200 years' experience to the condition of the globe 200,000 or 300,000 years ago†, seems an abuse of logic and of the rules of evidence. As one of Sir C. Lyell's numerous critics happily suggests, it is 'pretty much the same' as if a man finding that an individual nearly six feet in height

---

\* Antiquity of Man, p. 58.

† Mr. Darwin has had the temerity to estimate on similar principles a period of 306,662,400 years! (*Phillips' Address to Geological Society*, 1860.)

'had grown only half an inch last year, we were to conclude 'that he must be 140 years old.' (6.) On the other hand, numerous evidences go to prove (as our author is himself occasionally constrained to admit) that there are independent grounds for thinking that our earth has gradually been passing from a condition of more violent change to one of comparative tranquillity; and that during the pliocene and anterior times, upheavals, depressions, and fractures of every kind, with concomitant waves of disastrous energy, were more frequent, and far more intense than now.

It makes it a somewhat provoking task to argue against Sir Charles Lyell's defence of his peculiar uniformitarian views, that he every now and then makes admissions in *general* terms which simply negative the *particular* conclusions at which he has almost in the same sentence arrived. It would be easy to show from his writings that there is not one of the six objections just stated to his chronological scale which he has not somewhere or other, in language more or less guarded, admitted to have a real foundation, or to be an accurate expression of the truth. Yet he manages to leave the reader always impressed with the arguments on the side to which his own convictions lean. Definite and numerical statements will ever leave an impression of greater conviction than vague admissions of the uncertainty of the data will serve to undo. Beds of peat 30,000 years in forming, shells or pottery found at elevations or at depths hinted to measure thousands of years anterior to the reputed date of the creation of Man—these are inferences which fix themselves in the memory, and cannot be obliterated by feeble and reluctant qualifying clauses.

Sir Charles Lyell skilfully commences his work on the '*Antiquity of Man*' by tracing archæological monuments backwards beyond the limits of historic annals, and thus familiarising the mind with unquestionably long periods of unrecorded human history. On those remote times the researches of Danish and of Swiss antiquarians have thrown considerable light. The age of iron, the age of bronze, and the age of stone seem to indicate the receding stages of civilisation as we grope our way backwards through those obscure periods of human existence. The lake habitations of Switzerland and the shell-mounds or refuse heaps of the Danish islands, unquestionably reveal, with surprising distinctness, the way of life of the rude primitive inhabitants of those countries. But we have so recently devoted an entire article to these Lacustrine remains (*Ed. Rev.*, vol. cxvi. p. 153.) that it is needless to revert to this part of the subject.

In the absence of archæological grounds for measuring the antiquity of the remains of the ancient inhabitants of Switzerland and Denmark, we turn to geological or at least physical evidences. We have both there and in the New World probable proof that successive generations of forests may have flourished over the graves of the men of the Stone Age. There is a probability also (perhaps nothing more) that in Denmark the surface was then clothed with pine, next replaced by oak, and finally by the now prevailing beech; corresponding presumably to an amelioration of climate, which again fits in with the sub-arctic character of some of the fossil shells of the drift. Again, we are told that the oyster shells of the Danish mounds have a more oceanic character than those inhabiting the somewhat brackish waters of the Cattegat; and hence an inference that Jutland may then have been an island—indicating of course a considerable though not necessarily remote antiquity. But the numerical estimates of the date of the stone and bronze periods are usually based on the thickness of lacustrine deposits or of peat, under which they are often imbedded, and on the distances from the ancient shores of the lakes at which the remains of ‘lake dwellings’ are found contrasted with their present margins. There are so many assumptions—independently of the general assumption of the uniformity of these encroachments over long periods of time—that they convey, to us at least, scarcely any conviction of even approximate accuracy. They are liable to more than all the doubts which we have seen to attach to the chronology of the Nile deposits, and of the delta of the Mississippi.

We have now considered, to the best of our ability within the limits of our space, those portions of Sir Charles Lyell’s work which bear most directly on the subject of its title, the ‘*Antiquity of Man*.’ There are two other topics discussed in this volume only slenderly connected with the main question. These we have designedly omitted, or but slightly touched upon: the one is the state of the world in the Newer Pliocene, or as it is now often called the Glacial Epoch, into the details of which Sir C. Lyell enters at considerable length; but as no trace of Man has ever been even suspected in that formation, they seem to us to be here a little out of place. The other topic is the Darwinian Theory of Species, which, if true, carries Man’s existence back to a time when he was *not man*; but this has been so recently and so fully discussed in this Review, that we feel the more at liberty to pass it over.

Glancing at the work of Sir C. Lyell as a whole, it leaves the impression on our mind that we have been reading an ingenious

academical Thesis, rather than a work of demonstration by an original writer who is firmly and of his own knowledge convinced of what he maintains. He seems ever to aim at inducing the reader to draw an inference for himself, which the author is unwilling to state in definite terms, or to commit himself by entirely and *ex animo* affirming. This is the case with reference to the age of the Human Race, which is nowhere in this book stated with the slightest precision, but, as we have said, is rather insinuated than proved. We should have felt more satisfaction, whether in agreeing or in differing with the author, had he given us to understand what *his own conviction* is on this subject: — whether, for example, he reckons the human period by hundreds, or thousands, or tens of thousands of centuries. On this point, notwithstanding an occasional array of figures, we can draw no clear conclusion. Again, his belief in Darwinism, so significantly to be inferred from almost every part of the volume, is, we believe, nowhere positively stated; and in what regards the men of the cave period we have seen that the deductions are vacillating and incomplete. The argument from the analogy between the time required to introduce a new word into a language, and a new species into the chain of being, is rather rhetorical than apposite, and is not, we believe, even new. Lastly, even the doctrine of the uniformity of natural agencies, which forms the basis of anything approaching to a chronology in these pages, is never literally and definitely avowed; on the contrary, as we have already shown, its uncertainty is being continually allowed, whenever a difficulty in its application arises.

The ‘*Antiquity of Man*’ cannot be considered, and does not claim, to be an *original* work. There is no argument in it, and only a few facts which have not been stated elsewhere by Sir C. Lyell himself (sometimes in the same words), or by others. By combining the whole in a consecutive and popular form, the author has opened the discussion to a wider circle of readers than were likely to seek for information in the scattered volumes of the ‘*Philosophical Transactions*,’ the ‘*Geological Society’s Journal*,’ or the works of foreign naturalists and antiquarians. In doing this Sir Charles Lyell has done a service both to his readers and to science—to his readers, because he has placed in their hands a very pleasing and instructive volume; and to science, because, though open to the criticisms we have already made, it marshals in orderly array the elements of a subject which must henceforth occupy a great deal of attention,—the pre-historic yet comparatively recent annals of the globe.

Natural curiosity is justly excited by the attempt to de-



termine, from the records of physical change alone, the probable chronology of Man; and, although the words 'Moses' or 'the Bible' never once occur in Sir C. Lyell's book, no reader can fail to see that the credit of both is held by the author to be in some measure at stake in this inquiry. It is thus by implication connected with subjects now agitating the public mind, though very wide of purely scientific debates. The consciousness of a prevailing current of thought on this subject, never exactly rising to the surface, leaves the reader with that uncomfortable amount of scepticism which loosens one set of ideas without giving a firm hold to any by which they can be replaced. We do not think that many intelligent biblical students will be much disturbed by a very liberal modification of the received chronologies of the remoter portion of Old Testament history; but wide and infirm as may be the stepping stones by which future historians may have to intercalate the epochs of the patriarchal times as narrated in the book of Genesis, we must confess that we cannot detect in the pages of Sir C. Lyell any traces of a more stable and connected Physical Chronology. Most sensible men have for forty or fifty years been urging that the two records—the Biblical and the Geological—should not be prematurely contrasted, and we cannot but think that the time when this may safely or wisely be done seems really as far distant as ever.

We have just said that this undercurrent of thought affecting the Mosaic narrative gives to the discussion of the antiquity of Man a piquancy of interest at the present moment not, perhaps, favourable to its impartial discussion. We can hardly doubt that the only approximate solution likely to be attained for a very long period, *if ever*, will be of the nature of a compromise; that the Biblicists will have to expand the chronology of Usher by some thousands of years, whilst the Lyellians (or Huttonians) will be compelled to restrict their demands on past time in a still greater proportion. As we are here alone concerned with matters of geological evidence, we may state the two directions in which the inquiries excited primarily by the Abbeville discoveries are likely to be pushed with most success; and in which the volume more immediately before us, and the not inconsiderable mass of scattered literature which it represents, are likely to give a most useful and, we may add, hopeful impulse to legitimate inquiry.

*First*, the study of the Post-Pliocene or Quaternary, and Recent deposits is evidently about to undergo a great extension, and it may be trusted a satisfactory elucidation. What Cuvier and Sir Charles Lyell have done for the Tertiaries, and what Sir

Roderick Murchison has done for the Silurian and other palæozoic rocks, by establishing the subordination of the members of each series, and the number and order of succession of the beds by the aid of zoological classification,—all this is but just commencing for the newest formations, beginning with the boulder clay. It must be plain to the reader even of the condensed view of the more recent deposits given in Sir C. Lyell's volume, and still more when he turns to the numerous memoirs of which a few only have been referred to in the course of this paper, that anyone who should know only what was done respecting them twenty-five years ago will have to reconsider the whole. In the vague term of 'drift' have been included formations widely differing in age, material, circumstances of deposition, and imbedded organic remains. These have still in a great measure to be classified and distinguished, their order of superposition definitely fixed, their relations to the rising or sinking of continents established, and, perhaps above all, the fossils which characterise them properly distinguished and recorded. All these legitimate directions of geological and palæontological investigation are now fairly open. The patience and acumen which elsewhere have overcome so many similar difficulties are *certain* in time to be rewarded with success. We shall have an accurately defined succession of beds, marine or fluviatile, subdividing the boulder clay from the recent formations. These will be distinguished, some by the character of the shells which they contain, which will also lead to certain inferences as to progressive change of climate, if such there was: the still questionable evidence of the relative age of 'beaches' at different levels, and the changes of sea-level in historic times will, with increasing opportunities of observation, be reduced to something like consistency: the finer gradations of mammalian species or varieties, which in the case of the elephant are yielding to Dr. Falconer apparently trustworthy proofs of successive chronologies of the beds in which these varieties occur, promise perhaps more than any other recent discovery to aid in the subdivision of the quaternary beds\*, and in the distinction of casually inter-

---

\* Between the extinct species *Elephas primigenius* and *Mastodon Borsoni*, Dr. Falconer has already enumerated 'twenty-six species, 'some of them ranging as far back in time as the miocene period, 'others still living, like the Indian and African forms. He has discovered that no less than four species of elephants were formerly 'confounded together under the title of *Elephas primigenius*, 'whence its supposed ubiquity in post-pliocene times, or its wide 'range over half the habitable globe.' (See *Antiquity of Man*, pp. 186, 487.)

mixed materials from strata of properly defined age. That the existing fundamental opposition should have arisen between such eminent geologists as M. Elie de Beaumont on the one hand, and Sir C. Lyell and Mr. Prestwich on the other, as to the age of the Abbeville 'drift,' is sufficient evidence that the very grammar of this part of geology requires yet, if not to be written, at least to receive an adequate sanction. It is plain enough that this question (one example out of many which must be expected to arise) cannot be decided *brevi manu*, still less by a mere appeal to authority. Till M. Elie de Beaumont has an opportunity of displaying his proofs in detail of the 'recent' character of the flint drift containing tools and fossil bones, judgment must be suspended. Whilst hesitating, however, we incline to think that the more probable result will be to confirm the contemporaneity of Man with the mammoth and rhinoceros. Evidence pointing in one direction from so many quarters seldom fails in possessing some reliable basis. Chronologically speaking, the result will probably be that the current vague prepossession as to the excessive antiquity of these extinct quadrupeds will on the one hand be much diminished, while on the other the age of Man will be carried farther back.

*Secondly*, these discussions will necessarily bring to a more distinct issue than hitherto the hypothesis of Geological Uniformity. On the admission or otherwise of the principle that the rate of change observable on the existing surface of the globe—whether in the way of atmospheric waste, marine and fluvial degradation, volcanic deposition, or continental elevation,—is to be considered to be applicable to all the periods of past time, and all the changes which have occurred on its surface, however vast; on this principle, we say, wholly depends our power of estimating in years or in centuries the probable duration of geological and zoological revolutions; and amongst others, the date of the appearance of Man upon the globe. We have given some reasons in the course of this article for believing that the hypothesis of geological uniformity must ere long be wholly abandoned. We have even shown that Sir Charles Lyell himself is not unfrequently compelled to dissent from his own principles as leading to absurd results. Geological phenomena, so far as they depend on mechanical agencies, require for their manifestation and accomplishment both *force* and *time*. They depend on the combined effect of both. If a large effect is to be accounted for, the time may be supposed short if the force be great; if the forces are small, the period of their continuance must be long. In the pregnant language of Dr. Whewell, '*Time inexhaustible, and ever accu-*

‘mutating his efficacy, can undoubtedly do much for the theorist in geology; but *Force*, whose limits we cannot measure, and whose nature we cannot fathom, is also a power never to be slighted; and to call in the one to protect us from the other, is equally presumptuous, to whichever of the two our superstition leans.\* In Geology there are certainly many facts which cannot, without extravagant improbability, be supposed to have been accomplished without the lapse of immense periods of time. Such are the deposition of the coal measures, taking into account the time requisite for the growth and mineralisation of their vegetable contents; and the formation of highly fossiliferous coralline limestones. Generally, the element of organic life introduces into geology the necessity of long periods and occasional catastrophes. On the other hand, the truly gigantic revolutions indicated by the faults, elevations, marvellous plications and contortions, and even complete inversions of the strata which compose the vastest mountain chains of our globe, betoken subterranean forces quite unexampled in history. They also bear evidence to having been effected with considerable rapidity, and towards their accomplishment an eternity of duration allowed to existing forces could make no approximation. Even in the more intelligible field of the denudation caused by water, with its subsequent deposition of alluvia, the Coryphaeus of the uniformitarian school of Geology is himself forced to admit that rivers, such as the Thames for example, ‘could never, not even in millions of years, have excavated the valleys through which they flow.’† Now all these things are standing evidences that natural causes have, during the vast epochs of geological operations, had frequent remissions and exacerbations of intensity. Only a little consideration is necessary to show that the uniformity of the planetary motions offers no true analogy to the case of the far different agencies concerned in geological dynamics.‡ With reference to the newest formations which in this article we have chiefly had to consider, there seems little or no ground for maintaining a uniform scale of dynamic energy.

We should have been glad, had our already exhausted space permitted us, to refer fully to a very able and striking paper by Sir Roderick Murchison, on the ‘Drift of the South-east of

\* History of Inductive Sciences, book xviii. chap. viii.

† Lyell’s Principles, edit. 1834, vol. i. p. 500.

‡ ‘We find in the analogy of the sciences no confirmation of the doctrine of uniformity, as it has been maintained in geology.’ (Whewell, *History*, &c., book xviii. chap. viii.)

'England' \*—a formation geographically and geologically (as it seems to us), the counterpart of that of the valley of the Somme. In the valleys of Kent, Sussex, Surrey, and Hampshire, we find the same denudations of the chalk, the same angular flint terrace accumulations, accompanied by and enclosing remains of the same species of extinct animals, and which we can hardly doubt will on further search yield specimens of flint weapons or tools. Now in this district Sir R. Murchison perceived in 1851 evidence that the 'flint-drift' was not the lingering deposit of ages of comparative repose, but bore witness to short though turbulent agencies, performing, we may imagine, in a few years, the work for which the uniformitarian demands his hundreds or even thousands of centuries. In the first place he points out that the denudation of the vast area of the Weald of Sussex and the neighbouring counties must have been the result of upheavals, fractures, and accompanying denudations, to the intensity of which existing nature offers little or no analogy. He shows that the configuration of the steep slopes of the North and South Downs facing the Wealden Valley cannot possibly have been formed, as some theorists suppose, by ordinary diurnal action prolonged through countless ages. He next recognises the results of an agency of vast intensity, and clear proofs of a great force that drifted the flinty materials to the flanks of the denuded country in this district. He speaks of 'ancient' mounds of drift arranged irregularly and at different altitudes 'upon their banks from twenty to a hundred feet above the 'present rivers'—the counterparts, therefore, of the Menche-court and Moulin-Quignon beds at Abbeville. And, he adds, 'a glance at any of these materials at once bespeaks the tumultuary nature of their origin, for none of them contained 'waterworn or rounded pebbles. At Peppering, about eighty 'feet above the Arun, bones of an elephant were found' (p. 360.). And to quote but one sentence more from this very instructive paper, 'By no imaginable process of the longest continued diurnal action could any portion of this detritus have 'been gradually derived during ages from the low chalk hills' (p. 368.).†

The advocates of uniformity also are too apt to forget

---

\* Journal of Geological Society, vii. pp. 349–398 (1851).

† We must make room for one passage out of many in Sir R. Murchison's memoir, bearing upon M. Elie de Beaumont's idea of the casual deposition of elephantine remains from an older formation amidst the gravels of the Somme (which we take to be incontestably the equivalent of the drift-beds of Kent here spoken of). 'With the 'fact before us that these fossil bones [near Folkestone at 80 to 110

that ancient physical changes are admitted by them, which, though less tumultuary than gigantic earthquakes or great oceanic waves, are, through the wonderful sympathy of the powers of nature, capable of producing enormous mechanical effects. A depression of temperature of 20° of Fahrenheit seems to them to be a deviation from the existing state of things to be readily conceded. But if this resulted in clothing the surface of France and England with glaciers, we have a new mechanism of vast power introduced to which they readily appeal as the cause of the transport of enormous blocks of stone, for which 'existing causes' are in the same districts wholly inadequate. Indeed, far less changes of temperature would suffice to produce a condition of surface very different from the present one; and it seems impossible to maintain that the meteorology of the globe has endured as it is for hundreds of thousands of years. An increased rain-fall and a depressed temperature, followed by a rise sufficient to melt the ice-covering of the table-lands, might produce local floods of any required amount without violating the existing analogies of the globe. Indeed, if the geologists of the uniformitarian school will only compare the ideas of the present day with those of twenty-five years since, they will find that in the single word 'ice,' which forms the text of one-third of Sir C. Lyell's present volume, there has been added a vast armoury of Force to that which they previously could command. Its discovery has really metamorphosed pliocene and post-pliocene geology; and can it be conceded that no such farther agencies remain to be discovered consistent with existing analogies but throwing light upon the more gigantic and rapid operations of nature

'and even 222 feet above the sea] lie at once upon the bare rock *in situ* without any deposit between it and the drift in which they are commingled, it seems impossible to explain their collocation. . . . by supposing that they were tranquilly buried under a lake or fell from the banks of any former stream. . . . To my mind the circumstances of the same drift being placed at such different levels at Folkestone, and of its sloping up from the sea-board to a height of 222 feet inland, are good evidences that these creatures were destroyed by violent oscillations of the land, and were swept by currents of water from their feeding grounds into the hollows where we now find them, and where the argillaceous materials which covered them have favoured their conservation.' (*Murchison*, p. 386.) At no time does a doubt seem to have entered the mind of this distinguished geologist that the elephantine bones were otherwise than contemporary and characteristic fossils of the flint drift in which they are found.

in the later as well as older geological epochs? It would appear to us pedantic and illiberal in a high degree to disallow that such are not only conceivable, but far more intrinsically probable than a monotony of physical operation, the evidence for which seems to us to exist principally in the turn of thought of those who advocate it. These very glacial agencies have, *even now*, as we think, been too much relied on by the youngest school of our geologists, and we are not prepared to say, with Mr. Geikie, that 'it is superfluous at the present day to raise the ghosts of old floods and débâcles, which after playing so active a part in geology have now for a good many years been quietly consigned to oblivion.\*' All these, with glaciers, may have acted in succession, and in congruous relations to one another, producing the alternations of effect to which the strata of the globe bear such clear evidence. And inasmuch as these agencies were all apparently intensified modifications of the present ones, they diminish in the same ratio the periods of time requisite for filling up the intervals of the geological calendar; and amongst other such intervals, the duration of Man's existence upon the globe. Professor Phillips, a writer of singular moderation, and perhaps even excessive caution with reference to geological controversy, has in one of his addresses from the chair of the Geological Society expressed the views which we hold with such precision and firmness that we willingly close our article by citing his words:—

'Do not geologists sometimes speak with needless freedom of the ages that have gone? Such expressions as that "time costs Nature nothing" appear to me no better than the phrase which ascribes to Nature "the horror of a vacuum." Are we to regard as information of value the assertion that millions on millions of ages have passed since the epoch of life in some of the earlier strata? Is not this abuse of arithmetic likely to lead to a low estimate of the evidence in support of such random conclusions, and of the uncritical judgment which so readily accepts them?'†

---

\* On the Glacial Drift of Scotland, p. 73. (*Trans. Geol. Society of Glasgow*, 1863.)

† Phillips' Address to the Geological Society, 17th Feb., 1860, p. lii.

## MR. KINGLAKE'S INVASION OF THE CRIMEA.

(NOTE TO NO. CCXL.)

MR. KINGLAKE, conceiving that the note in page 309. of our last Number implies that his services were professionally retained in the defence of Sir Richard Airey before the Chelsea Board of Enquiry in 1855, wishes us to state that this was not the case, and that the part he took in that defence was gratuitous.

He also informs us that access to the unpublished political correspondence relating to the causes of the war was not refused to him by the Foreign Office (as we had been led to believe), in as much as he made no application to obtain it.

As Mr. Kinglake has expressed to us his desire that these two points should be explained we readily comply with his request. The anonymous strictures, which have appeared in several forms, but apparently from the same pen, upon the criticisms of Mr. Kinglake's History, do not appear to us to require any notice.

---

*No. CCXLII. will be published in October.*





7479 22.7.75

THE  
EDINBURGH REVIEW,  
OCTOBER, 1863.

---

N<sup>o</sup>. CCXLII.

---

- ART. I.—1. *Queensland—a highly eligible Field for Emigration, and the future Cotton-field of Great Britain.* By JOHN DUNMORE LANG, D.D., Representative of the City of Sydney in the Parliament of New South Wales. London: 1861.
2. *Pugh's Queensland Almanac, Directory, and Law Calendar for 1863.* Brisbane: 1862.
3. *Statistical Register of Queensland for the Years 1860–61–62.* Compiled in the Office of the Registrar-General. Brisbane: 1861–62–63.

THE Royal Botanic Gardens at Kew are chiefly indebted for their Australian flora to the researches of Alan Cunningham, a gentleman sent to Sydney by the British Government for the purpose of procuring specimens of the various productions of the Australian Continent, who so endeared himself to the inhabitants of that city by his amiable qualities, and his indefatigable zeal in the cause of geographical discovery, then of vital importance to its mountain-locked population, that his virtues and early death are commemorated by a public statue adorning their own very beautiful public gardens. In 1828, Mr. Cunningham, returning to Sydney from a botanical exploration conducted in the previous year, brought to its inhabitants the very welcome intelligence that upon an immense plateau, situated almost within the tropic, he had found the boundless waving pastures, the perennial streams, and the cool breezes so long sighed for by the flock-owners of New South Wales. He proposed to call this region the Darling Downs,

in honour of General Darling, then Governor of the vast and, as yet, undivided British territories of the Western Pacific. Dr. Leichhardt, whose fate is still involved in inscrutable mystery, pushed discovery with equally happy results still further to the north only a few months previous to that expedition of which all trace has been so strangely obliterated. Subsequently, Sir Thomas Mitchell, then Surveyor-General of New South Wales, reached the Fitzroy Downs, the Mantuan Downs, the Peak Downs, and various other portions of this vast table-land\*—advancing everywhere through a network of cool streams, and finding ‘delicious breezes welcoming us to the Torrid ‘Zone.’ And in 1845, Dr. Lang, whose work we have placed\* at the head of this article, visited for the first time these newly-discovered territories, and was chiefly instrumental in procuring their more direct settlement from the mother-country by three shiploads of emigrants. The scene of these discoveries, passing for several years under the name of the Moreton Bay District, is now known as the Colony of Queensland.

This latest addition to our Colonial Empire, and the fifth of the offshoots which the vast and vaguely defined colony of New South Wales has, from time to time, reluctantly suffered to assume an independent form of government, differs so materially in soil, climate, and capabilities from all the other Australasian settlements, that it may not be uninteresting if we devote to it some separate consideration—without, however, entirely losing sight of its Australian sisterhood, with which it must needs possess many common institutions and characteristics. It might, indeed, at first sight appear that the vast slopes and table-lands which constitute Queensland would most closely resemble those districts of the colonies of New South Wales and Victoria, through which the Great Coast Range of Eastern Australia continues its course. In reality, however, they have scarcely a natural feature in common. The hilly districts of Victoria, without soil or stream, and worthless if they did not yield gold, as well as the contorted, broken, and impassable ranges of New South Wales\*, offer, each in its way, a strange contrast to this more tropical extension of the Australian Cordillera, as it expands into richly-clothed and well-watered table-lands, plains, and downs.

In availing ourselves of the researches and considerable colo-

---

\* A Government surveyor, sent to examine a portion of this mountainous district of New South Wales, concluded his report to the Governor of the colony by ‘thanking God that he had got out of ‘it with his life.’

nial experience of Dr. Lang, as we propose to do in the course of the present article, we must do that gentleman the justice to acknowledge the large share of merit to which he is entitled in the formation of the new colony. While Alan Cunningham must be considered as the discoverer of Queensland, Dr. Lang may claim the credit of having wrested it from the tenacious grasp of New South Wales, as will be seen from the following resolution, unanimously adopted in the new Parliament of the colony :—

‘(1.) That the thanks of this House be given to the Rev. John Dunmore Lang, D.D., for his able and successful efforts for the separation of Moreton Bay from New South Wales, and to found the colony of Queensland. (2.) That this resolution be transmitted to His Excellency the Governor, with a request that he will be pleased to forward a copy of the same to Dr. Lang.’

Hitherto, fortunately, the gradual disintegration of the vast territories comprised within the limits of the Royal Commission issued to Captain Phillip in 1787, as first Governor of New South Wales, has been accomplished without any more violent commotion than the demolition of a few election hustings, and an occasional shower of stones directed against the daring candidate venturing to represent his somewhat neglected province in the distant Parliament of New South Wales. The extreme reluctance, however, with which the parent colony has consented to the erection of each independent State, and more especially the impediments placed in the way of the Port Phillip District in establishing its independence as the colony of Victoria, have left an amount of intercolonial jealousy which is very little understood in Europe, and which still retards the formation of that bond of union which should unite the Australian provinces. Indeed, grudgingly as Queensland has been permitted to assume her rights as one of these independent States, we must think that she has not yet come into the full enjoyment of them. The due administration of Australian affairs would certainly seem to favour the claim of her settlers—and, more especially, of a large body of settlers now excluded from her boundaries—to a further extension of territory towards the south from her niggard parent.

The case of Queensland against the parent colony of New South Wales appears to stand thus. In an Act of the Imperial Parliament, passed in 1850, ‘for the better government of the ‘Australian Colonies,’ a clause had been inserted, reserving to Her Majesty the right to separate from New South Wales, and to erect into an independent colony, the territory situated to the north of the *thirtieth parallel of south latitude*—that parallel

being indicated by some very marked natural features, extending from the sea-shore to the western boundary of New South Wales, and the country along its whole line being of so broken a character as to impede all overland communication between that colony and what was then the Moreton Bay District. In accordance with the terms of this clause, numerous petitions, extending over several years, were forwarded for presentation to Her Majesty by the settlers throughout the Moreton Bay District, praying for separation at the specified parallel; and, more especially, one petition, dating so far back as the 30th of December, 1850, from the settlers in the Clarence and Richmond Rivers District, the territory now in dispute.\* Owing to some representations—or, as the later petitions boldly state, misrepresentations—from New South Wales, which never willingly parted with a foot of her vast territories (the old Commission of 1787 extending over Van Diemen's Land, New Zealand, and more generally the whole of the Western and Southern Pacific waters and islands), this reserved right of Her Majesty to fix the boundary line between the parent colony and the new offshoot was not exercised, and the matter was referred to the decision of the Governor of New South Wales. By him a line was chosen coinciding with the twenty-eighth parallel from the coast to the culminating table-land of the Great Range, and, from thence to the west, with the twenty-ninth parallel. In this manner, the whole of the Clarence and Richmond Rivers District now remains within the colony of New South Wales. It is well watered by these two navigable streams and by several smaller ones. Settlement, too, having grown from the south northwards, its pastures contain more numerous flocks and herds, and bear evidence, in public and private improvements, of a longer occupancy than more northern tracts. These, and other considerations, render its possession of considerable importance to either colony. Indeed, though small in comparison with the huge territories with which we are now dealing, the district itself is larger than England, and contains some of the most fruitful land in the world. Omitting, however, the rival claims of the two colonies—if, indeed, New South Wales has any better claim than possession—omitting, too, all consideration of the natural features of the country, the mere element of distance would appear to be strongly in favour of the Clarence and Richmond settlers in their desire to annex

---

\* See later Petition to the Queen, from the inhabitants of the Clarence and Richmond Rivers, for annexation to Queensland, dated September, 1860.

themselves to Queensland. Grafton, their central town, is 470 miles from Sydney, while it is only 180 miles from Brisbane, the capital of the new colony. Indeed, these settlers now transact all their private affairs with Brisbane, though, in the case of the public improvements of their district, they exhibit a woful balance-sheet against the Sydney Exchequer, into which their custom duties, assessment on stock, and the proceeds of their land-sales necessarily go. The annexation of this district to Queensland would place Sydney in the middle of a seaboard of 600 miles in extent, as the crow flies, while she would still remain the capital of a territory three times as large as Great Britain. Unless, therefore, it should be thought desirable that a new colony should insert itself between Queensland and New South Wales—an event which, in the extremely unsatisfactory position of Australian land tenure, and the difficulty of fairly apportioning the expenditure on public works among the more outlying districts, is almost certain to occur unless some such proposition as the Clarence and Richmond settlers suggest should be adopted—it would seem more generally advantageous to the settlers of this great eastern seaboard of the continent that the Imperial Act of 1850 should be more strictly interpreted.

But though we are of opinion that the internal administration and improvement of the Australian group of colonies demand the annexation of the Clarence and Richmond Rivers settlers to Queensland, yet the colony of Queensland itself is at present of gigantic proportions, and must be prepared, in its turn, to throw off large and early northern offshoots. According to the present Parliamentary boundaries of the new colony, Queensland extends from the termination of the Clarence and Richmond Rivers District to the extreme northern point of Australia, and from the shores of the Pacific to the 138th meridian of east longitude. She thus possesses a length of 1,300 miles, and a mean breadth of 900 miles, with a Pacific and Torres Strait seaboard of, as the crow flies, 2,250 miles. In other words, she is somewhat larger than Great Britain and Ireland, France, Spain and Portugal, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, and the new Kingdom of Italy, all put together. And yet such is the rapidity of Australian squatter settlement, that our latest information leads us to expect its extension to the shores of the Gulf of Carpentaria ere these pages have passed through the press.

Indeed, as it may be very shortly necessary to bring the new colony within more reasonable bounds, we shall here briefly point out what we conceive her permanent limits ought to be.

They were suggested so early as 1846 by Sir Thomas Mitchell, no incompetent authority, in the course of his explorations within tropical Australia. Advancing beyond the twenty-fifth parallel of latitude, he found the broad, almost level table-lands of the Great Range interrupted by a natural barrier, running at right angles to its main axis, and, in other respects, similar to the broken line of country we have already mentioned as crossing the same Range to the south of the Clarence and Richmond Rivers District. The territory to the north of this natural barrier he proposed to erect into a new and independent colony, under the name of 'Capricornia—to express the country 'under the tropics, from the parallel of 25° south, where Nature 'has set up her own landmarks not to be disputed.' This broken tract of country quickly terminates towards the north, and the table-lands again resume their broad and undulating character. Dr. Leichhardt, however, who pushed discovery still further to the north, found another and a similar break crossing the Range at the eighteenth parallel, after which the country again opens into Captain Stokes' Plains of Promise, round the shores of the Gulf. Thus, giving 'Capricornia' an extent of seven degrees of latitude—that is, close on 500 miles of Pacific seaboard—there would still be abundant material for a third new colony on the shores of the Gulf. According to this arrangement, coinciding with strongly-marked natural features, the Great Coast Range and its Pacific seaboard would be divided into the following sections:—New South Wales,  $6\frac{1}{2}$  or  $5\frac{1}{2}$  degrees of latitude, according as her present hold of the Clarence and Richmond Rivers settlers is confirmed or otherwise; Queensland, 5 or 4 degrees of latitude, according to the same condition; 'Capricornia,' 7 degrees; and a new colony on the Gulf, 10 degrees. Such an arrangement would certainly allot to Queensland a less extended seaboard than her neighbours; but this would be more than compensated by her much greater breadth inland, while it would place her capital and chief seaport in the middle of her maritime district. Indeed, it would still leave her a territory quite as large as the parent colony of New South Wales. This arrangement would, however, be strongly opposed by Queensland herself, since it would deprive her of the Fitzroy River and the Port Curtis District; and young colonies are quite as tenacious of their unexplored territorial privileges as the oldest States of Europe.

As we have so far postponed our examination of the general resources of the new settlement, in considering its political boundaries, perhaps we may be excused if we take a passing glance at the relative positions of the other members of the

group. New South Wales, even should she lose the Clarence and Richmond Rivers District, would still possess an extent of upwards of 300,000 square miles; though whether she shall continue to preserve these very ample territories must mainly depend upon her skill in managing her outlying districts. At the present moment the settlers dwelling between the rivers Darling and Murrumbidgee, both in New South Wales and Victoria, are desirous of separation, on the old plea of neglect, and have already forwarded petitions to the Imperial Parliament, praying for recognition of their claims. We cannot, however, regard very hopefully the prospects of a new colony some 300 miles removed from the seaboard in a country so deficient in internal water communication; and, in the interest of the settlers themselves, we should prefer an extension of those powers of local self-government which have been successfully introduced and established in the gold-fields of Victoria.\* Should the Murray and Murrumbidgee settlers adopt this view of the matter, we may fairly infer that the colony of New South Wales has now arrived at its last stage of dismemberment, and that its present territories will be left intact—unless, indeed, under some more violent disruption of the country. The colony of Victoria, the wealthiest and most compact, though far the smallest of the group, contains 86,831 square miles—an extent, however, which, notwithstanding her diminutive appearance among her sisterhood, closely coincides with the area of Great Britain. Her next neighbour, however, the colony of South Australia, again expands into giant proportions. Its present area is about 300,000 square miles; and, in all probability, it will shortly receive a further accession of territory from a neutral strip of the continent lying to the north of it, between the 138th meridian, or western boundary of Queensland, and the 141st meridian, or eastern boundary of the colony of Western Australia. Much of this area, however, consists of trackless desert; and though recent explorations have shown it to be

---

\* By later intelligence, we perceive that the colony of Victoria is extending a somewhat similar principle of local self-government to her various other outlying districts, including her above-mentioned territories between the Murray and Murrumbidgee. By her new Local Government Act, each district becomes entitled to 2*l.* from the State Revenue for each 1*l.* raised by taxation under its Local Board, with the further addition of 200*l.* for each mile of main road. The more general extension of some such measure throughout the whole of the Australian Colonies would, most probably, check any too minute disintegration, to which at present there appears a tendency.



interspersed with large tracts of pastoral and even agricultural country, the isolated position of these oases, and their dependence on the Port of Adelaide for imports and exports, will in all probability avert any dismemberment of this colony for very many years to come. But the palm of size must be awarded to the colony of Western Australia. Its present area exceeds a million of square miles—an extent which its population, notwithstanding the extraordinarily expansive powers of squatter occupancy, is wholly unable to overrun. The time, however, cannot be very far distant when the excellent soil and the broad navigable rivers of its north-west portion, and, above all, its propinquity to China, India, and the Indian Archipelago, will attract settlement thither, destined to a more rapid progress than has attended the Swan River colonists. Indeed, a project is now on foot throughout the more eastern Australian colonies to form a British settlement round Cambridge Gulf and its streams; and other equally favourable tracts along this vast north-west coast have more than once attracted the attention of both home and colonial enterprise. With the execution of these schemes will commence a disintegration of the vast territories over which the Governor of the Swan River settlement now nominally holds sway.

This breaking up of a whole continent into distinct States, independent of each other, but under the light and delicate rule of one Imperial Government, is an exceedingly curious movement in the history of civilisation. It is essayed under singularly favourable circumstances; and though the nature of our subject will oblige us to lay bare some of the minor difficulties of Australian colonisation, yet there would certainly appear to be no inherent defect to mar the success of the experiment upon which the Australian people are now entering.

One blemish, indeed, now almost erased by the very great efforts of the colonists of the eastern group, it is proposed by a late Royal Commission to perpetuate on Australian soil; and we cannot proceed to the more immediate subject of this article without here recording our strong protest against the recommendation to continue and extend transportation to Western Australia. The views of the Convict Commission on this subject have, we believe, taken wholly by surprise everyone who has watched the progress of Australian settlement and the singular promise which that portion of our colonial empire gives of a great and glorious future. Nor can the willingness of the colonists of its western quarter to receive convicts afford the least pretext for so wide a departure from the principles of justice and

the common weal. These colonists, numbering but a few thousand, have hitherto earned little pretension to fix the fate of the vast regions which they still leave an untrod wilderness; nor, whatever may be the undeveloped resources of that portion of the continent, have its settlers as yet made it sufficiently attractive to retain among them the convict after his term of penal servitude has expired. Transportation to Western Australia amounts practically to transportation to Eastern Australia, with the very unconscionable addition that the eastern colonists must treat as free men the cutthroats whom their own fairly-earned prosperity draws to their shores. Indeed, how the past experience of some of those eastern colonies could have been so wholly overlooked in an inquiry of this nature, we are at a loss to understand. The most wealthy of them, the colony of Victoria, was never a convict settlement. The Acts of its Legislature to restrain convicts from landing on its shores exhibit perhaps the utmost violation of the liberty of the subject which a British Parliament could be found to assent to. They condemned to penal servitude every person unable to give proofs of possessing lawful means of support. They condemned to penal servitude for life every ticket-of-leave person entering within its territories. Yet, notwithstanding these and other exceptional acts of legislation, it is matter of world-wide notoriety that the colony of Victoria became the resort of the most daring desperados of Norfolk Island, Van Diemen's Land, and Botany Bay, and that its gold-fields, public roads, and even the leading streets of Melbourne were for some years the scenes of their lawless and appalling deeds. By the construction of costly prisons—by the organisation of a large and enormously expensive police system, the colonists of Victoria have now succeeded in rendering innocuous the vast number of these trespassers on their fair domains, and in making them as safe as any portion of the British Islands. The task we may well take to have been no light one for a young State possessed of no superabundant supply of labour, and engaged in the various public improvements of a new land. Indeed, its colonists received their chief encouragement to its accomplishment in the closing of the various neighbouring penal depôts we have just enumerated, and the belief that the supply from these sources had finally ceased. We cannot wonder, therefore, if the contemplated opening of a fresh source of supply should fill this colony with 'the utmost alarm,' and if 'it would be disheartening beyond endurance were she again forced to combat the same dangers from which she has been

‘rescued at such a cost.’\* Indeed, lest by any means these most unmerited calamities of this, and other free neighbouring colonies, should have escaped the recollection of the late Commission, they are again brought before their notice in the strong but dignified protest from which we have just quoted; and we would earnestly recommend its consideration, and that of the short portion of Australian history to which it refers, before Parliament proceeds to legislate on the subject. A government which should deliberately resolve to consign the felons of England to the shores of Australia, against the will of the Australians themselves, would deserve to link with that government which attempted to tax the North American colonies without their consent: and we do not doubt that the result would be either a humiliating defeat to ourselves, or a deplorable rupture between the colonists and Great Britain.

With this glance at the relative position of the whole of the Australian group of colonies, we shall now confine ourselves to the colony of Queensland, as contained between its present Parliamentary boundaries.

The natural features of this tract of Australian soil are strongly marked. They consist (1.) of a seaboard from 50 to 100 miles broad; (2.) an elevated table-land, or, more strictly speaking, a succession of undulating downs or plains, situated some 2,000 feet above the sea-level, and stretching back to the west for 400 or 500 miles, without continuous rise or fall; and (3.) a succession of terraces descending, generally with rapidity, but in some places less perceptibly, until the more extended level of the interior of the continent is reached. There are thus three portions of territory, widely differing in their peculiar capabilities, which it may be of interest to examine a little more closely.

This seaboard owes its origin to the action of a network of streams, issuing from the more elevated table-land, and bringing down with them the disintegrated particles from the flanks of the Great Range. Indeed, the process may be still seen going on in the immediate neighbourhood of the sea-shore, and on a series of muddy and sandy islands lying off the coast, which are thus yearly growing in size. The more upland portions, however, nearer the Great Range, have long ceased to derive any addition from this source, and now form most excellent districts for the growth of wheat, maize, and other cereals, which they produce in great luxuriance, yielding generally two crops in the year,

---

\* Address to the Queen by the Legislative Assembly of Victoria, March 25, 1863.

and as much as 80 and 100 bushels to the acre.\* Indeed, the deep alluvial character of the soil and the plentiful supply of warm showers, caused by the influence of the Great Range, combine to produce a very remarkable degree of fertility, while the well-sustained slope of the whole seaboard prevents that accumulation of stagnant waters which communicates so unhealthy a feature to many similarly luxuriant regions within the tropics. The scenery throughout this whole tract, and more especially along the course of its numerous streams, is of the most delightful character.

‘Close to the water’s edge rises a complete wall of luxuriant foliage. Fig-trees, bean-trees, pines, and a variety of other trees, stand thickly set and overhung with a rich drapery of creepers, presenting the forms of turrets, buttresses, festoons, and stalactites, in endless variety, and bespangled with flowers and fruit. There is a purple convolvulus, wild roses, tulips, and some yellow flowers, scattered high and low; and, close to the water’s edge, a pure white lily. Cherries, figs, and mulberries overhang the water.’ (*Lang*, p. 43.)

More often, however, the course of these streams lies through a succession of thinly-treed plains.

‘The principal feature of this day’s journey is a series of beautiful flats, or plains of limited extent, each surrounded with an amphitheatre of hills, with the river, flanked with tall trees, and occasionally with lofty cedars, stealing silently along in its deep bed. When the country gets settled with an agricultural population, each of these flats or plains will doubtless have its smiling cottage, farmyard, and comfortable garden, where the pine-apple, the sugar-cane, and the banana will be found in willing association with all the fruits of Northern Europe. For there is nothing more remarkable in this part of our colonial territory than the way in which the fruits of the temperate and torrid zones grow harmoniously together in the same garden-plot, and fructify and come to maturity each in its proper season.’ (*Lang*, p. 47.)

Not, however, to dwell longer on the luxuriance of a region to which we shall have occasion to return in examining the general fitness of Queensland for the production of cotton, sugar, and tobacco, we shall here content ourselves by mentioning the following almost incredible example of healthy and rapid growth, as reported by the same writer:—

‘I may also mention, as a remarkable instance of the extraordinary fertility of the district, that a young peach-tree, about eight feet high,

---

\* In the neighbourhood of Adelaide, colony of South Australia, the ordinary crop attains to 45 bushels per acre. The English crop, in the best wheat counties, averages 26½ bushels; that of Canada seldom attains to 15. Australian wheat is probably the best in the world.

and covered with blossoms, happened to attract my notice in the garden of the Rev. James Collins, Tyrone Villa, near Grafton ; and Mr. Collins informed me that the peach-stone, from which that tree had grown, had been planted by himself in the month of January preceding, only eight months before.'

As we descend this slope, however, to the immediate borders of the sea-coast, much of the land assumes a more dreary aspect, consisting chiefly of mangrove-swamps, sand-banks, and 'drowned land,' in actual process of formation. But, though less refreshing to the eye, there is reason to suppose that these tracts will prove highly valuable for the cultivation of those varieties of the cotton plant which love 'salt swamp.'

The shore is well supplied with bays, some of very considerable extent, as Moreton Bay, Wide Bay, Port Curtis, and numerous others. These bays, however, are not so much indentations of the coast-line as enclosures formed by the islands we have already mentioned. Moreton Bay itself is some 60 miles long and 20 wide; and they are all supplied with rivers, navigable for 50, 60, and 100 miles inland. Moreton Bay possesses no less than five such valuable rivers, besides some smaller ones. One of these, the Brisbane, gives its name to the capital city of the colony, situated 22 miles from its mouth. At this distance, however, the mangrove-swamps are entirely passed, and the city stands upon a scene of surprising beauty.

'The noble river, which winds almost under foot, and appears and disappears, and appears again, as it pursues its tortuous course through the dark forest to the bay, or is traced upwards to its sources, presents, ever and anon, points of view surpassingly beautiful; the thick brushes on its banks, with the majestic Moreton Bay pine overtopping all the other giants of the forest, merely indicating the spots of extraordinary fertility where the hand of man is perhaps erecting his future dwelling, and transforming the wilderness into smiling farms and fruitful fields.'

The river here is, a quarter of a mile wide—a width which it preserves for several miles upwards: indeed, the Brisbane is navigable for 150 miles inland, and steamers now daily ply up its course. The population of the city amounts to 8,000, and numerous handsome villas are rapidly rising on a succession of terraces overlooking the town and commanding splendid views of the surrounding country. The city itself stands considerably above sea-level, and has, up to the present, been distinguished for its very healthy climate, both during the summer and winter months. Indeed, excepting the neighbourhood of Sydney, which is perhaps the most beautiful city-site in the world, it would be difficult to select a more charming scene

than that which has been chosen as the chief shipping port of a vast and wonderfully productive region, destined doubtless to supply the Old World with most of its wool, if not also of its cotton and other commodities hitherto slave-grown. As these bays, too, abound with fish, turtle (of an excellence long known throughout the neighbouring colonies), and crabs of three and four pounds' weight and very superior quality, and as the deep fisheries off the coast teem with several varieties of large fish of peculiar and most delicate flavour, it is difficult to assign bounds to the great natural resources of this whole line of seaboard.

From it we shall now ask the reader to accompany us to the great table-land constituting the flat back of the Great Coast Range.

This Range, as we have already stated, attains to its mean elevation, or almost to its mean elevation, at a distance of from 50 to 100 miles from the sea-shore. Nor does it begin to descend into the interior, with any marked or continuous depression, until the sources of Mitchell's Victoria River, about the 147th meridian, are passed. We have thus, commencing from the southern bounds of the colony, an elevated region some 400 or 500 miles broad, stretching away thence to the shores of the Gulf of Carpentaria—a distance of over 1,000 miles, giving an area of more than 400,000 square miles. The whole of this area, with the exception of the two partial interruptions we have already mentioned, may be described as a succession of wide open downs, enclosed each within small subsidiary basaltic ranges traversing the great plateau. These downs are each of immense extent, and contain deep and most excellent agricultural soil, at present clothed with the richest grasses, growing in wonderful luxuriance. They are in a great measure destitute of trees, but the bases of their enclosing ranges are furnished with a very handsome and stately description of pine, behind which, and retiring into their recesses, are found some very valuable cedar-trees. These recesses are very plentifully supplied with numerous springs and rills, which, trickling down the slopes of the ranges, and traversing the enclosed plains, unite, and form the abundant network of rivers by which this immense plateau is watered. Some of these rivers—as the Clarence, the Richmond, the Brisbane, the Fitzroy, the Burdekin, the Maranoa, the Balonne, the Warrego, the Victoria—are of considerable extent, and traverse in their windings, peculiar to all Australian watercourses, immense tracts of country. Indeed, the Victoria, without taking into consideration its windings at all, possesses a curiously protracted length

of some 1,500 miles, at which it may not be uninteresting to take a glance when considering the third or western portion of the colony. These streams, according as their main course tends to the east or the west, discharge themselves into the Pacific or the interior of the continent, and hence the term of 'the Great Dividing Range' which has been applied to this vast table-land, as parting the eastern and western waters of the continent; though, as the Range is entirely confined to the eastern seaboard, the term itself is somewhat misleading. Of course, we may look in vain throughout Australia for anything approaching to the stupendous water system of America, but it is difficult to exaggerate the importance of these streams to settlers dwelling on, and even within, the tropic. Indeed, they draw from Dr. Lang the following somewhat indignant protest:—

'In short, notwithstanding the generally received calumny to which the great "South Land" has hitherto been subjected in Europe, as being destitute of "springs of water," and to a vast extent hopelessly barren and unavailable for the purposes of man, it would perhaps be difficult to point to any tract of country of equal extent, and within the same parallels of latitude in either hemisphere, in which there is a greater number either of streams of water or of rivers available for navigation.'

Travellers throughout these vast plains all concur in their admiration of the luxuriance of the soil, the coolness and salubrity of the climate, and the loveliness of the entire landscape. We could fill pages with descriptions of countless rills issuing cool and limpid from their pine-clad slopes—of deep rivers stealing through waving meadows—of the golden sunlight, the rosy atmosphere, and the songs of innumerable birds which give an additional charm to each scene. We shall content ourselves, however, with a more late extract, in which it will be seen how rapidly the hand of man is turning to advantage these bounties of Providence. We take the following from a speech of the new Governor of Queensland, Sir George Bowen, delivered to the inhabitants of the town of Drayton on the occasion of His Excellency's visit to the Darling Downs, amid which the township has been recently erected:—

'I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to state publicly that my recent journey over the Darling Downs has filled me with surprise and admiration. Even before I left England, I knew by report the rich natural resources and the picturesque beauty of this district, the scenery of which vividly recalls to my mind the general aspect of the classic plains of Thessaly. But I confess that I was not fully prepared for so wonderfully rapid an advance in all that can promote

and adorn civilisation—an advance which has taken place during the fourth part of an average lifetime. Not only have I seen vast herds of horses and cattle, and countless flocks of sheep, overspreading the valleys and forests, which, within the memory of persons who have yet scarcely attained to the age of manhood, were tenanted only by wild animals and by a few wandering tribes of savages,—not only have I travelled over roads beyond all comparison superior to the means of communication which existed less than a century ago in many parts of the United Kingdom,—not only have I beheld flourishing towns arising in spots where, hardly twenty years back, the foot of a white man had never yet trodden the primeval wilderness,—not only have I admired these and other proofs of material progress,—but I have also found, in the houses of the long chain of settlers who have entertained me with such cordial hospitality, all the comforts and most of the luxuries and refinements of the houses of country gentlemen in England. The wonderful advance of this portion of the colony during the last ten years is due to no sudden and fortuitous discovery of the precious metals; it is derived wholly from the blessing of Providence on the skill and energy of its inhabitants in subduing and replenishing the earth. Assuredly, I have observed during the past week very remarkable illustrations of the proverbial genius of the Anglo-Saxon race for the noble and truly imperial art of colonisation.

The whole of this almost boundless plateau—extending within the tropics, but elevated 2,000 feet above sea-level—is peculiarly fitted for a wide range of crops. Indeed, as vegetation is continued during the whole year, the farmer has only to choose his various seasons for bringing most of the productions of the temperate and tropical zones to maturity. Thus, wheat, oats, barley, maize, potatoes (and more especially the sweet potato, which here grows to the immense weight of twenty and even thirty pounds), arrow-root, indigo, and, more generally, all the productions of the kitchen garden, have already been cultivated with great success. At present, however, with the exception of some half-dozen incipient townships and their surrounding farms, these tablelands are clothed throughout their vast extent with the rich and luxuriant natural grasses of the country, and are roamed over by the flocks and herds of some widely scattered sheep and cattle owners. And here, indeed, for many years to come, the squatter—that peculiar feature of Australian settlement—will find a secure and ample stronghold, if forced to retire before the growing wave of more crowded centres of population. Nor can we conduct the reader to still more western regions, forming the third and last portion of our geographical sketch, without dwelling for a while on this marked and powerful characteristic of antipodean colonisation, promising, as it now does, to contribute vast stores of wealth to the



colony of Queensland as a wool-growing country, and, more generally, lying at the very root of that most all-absorbing of colonial topics, the tenure of land. If the reader would seek some explanation of that strange cry of a mere handful of people, thinly sprinkled on the borders of a vast continent, for a little land to grow cabbages and potatoes, he must seek it in the history of the Australian Squatter.

The term is indeed to be found in the United States of America. Nor is the humble pioneer of American settlement, yielding to the ever-advancing tide of population, and constructing some more distant 'clearing' in the deeper depths of the primeval forest, without his influence in the peopling of those vast western regions. Yet the contrast is indeed curious between the American squatter and his Australian namesake. The former is poor and illiterate: the Australian squatter is wealthy, and, in nine cases out of ten, a scholar and a gentleman. The law scarcely deigns to recognise the small patch on which the American squatter raises corn and vegetables for the support of his family: the Australian squatter holds tracts as large as English counties, but is forbidden to break the sod. The very negro of the Southern States affects to despise the 'mean whites' who 'locate,' in sufferance, on the borders of his master's vast domains. The Australian squatters compose the aristocracy of the land; they have for years convulsed the whole structure of colonial society, they have driven shiploads of fellow-colonists to seek more distant homes in climes far less favoured by nature, and they have continued, almost from their origin, to overawe the very Representative of the Crown. If the reader would trace the introduction of that curious American 'institution,' the stump-orator, into our Colonial Empire,—if he would inquire into the strange insecurity of Australian Treasury Benches,—if he wonders why each successive Ministry and each successive Parliament should so hopelessly toil over that Sisyphean stone, a 'Land Bill,'—if he asks the meaning of those indignant demands, 'Unlock the 'lands,'—he may find them all in the fierce strife which has now for some years been waged between the squatters and their fellow-colonists throughout the Australian settlements. How a few gentlemen, many of whom had passed from the *Bucolics* of Virgil to the more practical, though equally peaceful, clipping of sheep, could effect all this, may be no uninteresting inquiry in connexion with those vast tracts of pastoral country to which our task has conducted us.

That impure stream which flowed into Botany Bay from its opening as a convict depôt, continued, for several years, to deter

any more eligible source of colonising its sunny shores. Each Governor, indeed, generally succeeded in bringing out in his own ship a few of his family adherents or more humble fellow-townsmen. Yet, though a free passage and various other encouragements were offered to all such persons, and though those who availed themselves of them rapidly rose to affluence, still the distance, then immense—a ship seldom making the voyage in less than six months—and, above all, the black pall of crime which hung over the new settlement in European eyes, made the number of these free settlers exceedingly limited. About the year 1821, however, Australian society began to be supplied from a widely different source. Unexpected discoveries in exploration were then opening large tracts in the more inland districts, scantily supplied with trees, but bearing natural crops of luxuriant and most nutritious grasses. On these, sheep were found to thrive wonderfully, and even to improve in their wool. The great salubrity of the climate, with, perhaps, the Arcadian beauty of the scenery—the failure in inducing agricultural labourers to emigrate to Australia—and the little prospect there was of a near market for perishable agricultural produce, pointed out these plains as naturally suitable for sheepwalks; and into sheepwalks the Colonial Executive, under the guidance of Governor Brisbane, made an effort to turn them. A statement of their advantages was drawn up and sent home, free use of lands, proportioned in extent to the amounts of real and available capital to be used in stocking them, being offered to all intending sheep-farmers. The minimum sum was fixed at 500*l.*, sufficient proof of the possession of which was to be the sole condition of the transfer of ‘a run,’ or sheep-station. Small as the sum was, it fixed, at an early period, the respectability of the class which availed itself of the offer. Officers retiring from the army and navy, younger sons of wealthy and even titled families, university graduates who had not yet selected professions, with a sprinkling of those already dissatisfied with the professions they had selected, flocked into Sydney, and began to compose chiefly the new Pastoral Tenants of the Crown—the term Squatter being then wholly unknown.\* The Colonial Government

---

\* The term squatter was originally applied to a class of men—Donald Beans of the antipodes—who, chiefly escaped convicts and outlaws, dwelt on the outskirts of the runs of the more legitimate pastoral tenants of the Crown, and committed depredations on their sheep and cattle, thus accumulating flocks and herds of their own. When these tenants of the Crown lost their early popularity, the term was transferred to themselves, and gradually crept into the phraseology of colonial legislative enactments.

made no deduction from their capital for the use of the lands, nor was any rent charged until a later period; but the lands were still to be Crown lands, merely placed in the temporary possession of the tenant, until needed for other public purposes. In other words, the Colonial Executive 'let the grass,' and made no charge for the use of it.

A few years afterwards, this movement received a great and somewhat novel accession of strength. Among the plentiful crop of joint-stock companies which distinguished the first quarter of the present century, there was one started in 1825, under the name of the Australian Agricultural and Wool-growing Company, which received a grant of a million of acres, in the immediate neighbourhood of Sydney, from the Imperial Government, and commenced operations under other and very attractive circumstances. These operations necessitated, in the first instance, the purchase of a large quantity of stock; and the demand, arising unexpectedly among a small community, forced up the price of cattle and sheep to a most preposterous amount. Sheep which, in ordinary years—such was the rapidity of their multiplication—were worth little more than the couple of pounds of wool on their backs\*, suddenly rose to five guineas a head, and the prices of horses and working bullocks received a proportional increase. Nevertheless, the manager and his agents, undaunted by such difficulties, purchased all that came in their way. Though settlement in the interior was still slow, the seaport of Sydney had already risen to the proportions of a large and flourishing city, and the calculations put forward by the new company were now more minutely examined by its inhabitants. If shareholders, residing at the other side of the globe, could find profit from an outlay at first appearance so extravagant, it was not unreasonable to suppose that a private capitalist, superintending his own affairs, might obtain equally favourable returns. A sheep and cattle mania seized the whole population of New South Wales. The citizens of Sydney walked about with their pockets stuffed with samples of colonial wools. Barristers, doctors, and even clergymen, fought in the cattle-markets for the possession of a tottering calf or a broken-kneed horse. Sheep became as valuable as Dutch tulips, and sheep-farming took the position of Roman usury. To possess 'a run'

---

\* The fleece of an Australian sheep weighs from two to three pounds, or little more than one-third that of the English Southdown. While, however, the English fleece averages about one shilling per pound, that of Australia ranges from two shillings and sixpence to three shillings.

became the essential qualification of every one aspiring to the rank of an Australian Gentleman. Nor, owing to the overwhelming pressure upon him, was the Governor long able to maintain the proposed condition of 500*l*. From 500*l*. it gradually dwindled to the more vague condition of 'sufficient capital;' from sufficient capital it fell to the still more vague condition of 'respectability.' It was loudly complained that Government officers and the personal friends of the Governor each possessed several runs in various separate districts; while the Governor himself was subjected to insult and even violence, in the public streets, from rejected claimants for land. The gambling, too, quickly extended from the sheep and cattle to the runs. Every available territory was soon appropriated, and the scene of each new discovery in exploration was overrun as quickly as it became known.

With occasional interruptions from drought, disease, overtrading in paper currency, &c., the new sheep-farmers met with a success scarcely to be expected from the early rashness of their speculations. Sheep multiplied wonderfully; their wool was eagerly sought in Europe, and fetched the highest price in the market; and the nature of the country rendered necessary no preliminary, and very little current, expense. Indeed, we may learn somewhat of the profits of this pursuit from one of the earliest debates in the new Parliament of Queensland. On a motion to raise the Governor's salary from 2,500*l*., as originally proposed by the Secretary of State, to 4,000*l*., a member observed that '2,500*l*. a year was only equal to the 'income of a second-rate squatter.' The new class, too, which thus so rapidly overran the Australian colonies, was composed of men of considerable energy and intelligence, untiring in their efforts to forward their interests, and ever ready and willing to fight their own battles against the landless classes which were now beginning to grow on Australian soil. But, above all, their education naturally brought them to form an overwhelming portion, if not the whole, of each of the various 'nominee' councils and legislative assemblies which assisted the Colonial Governors up to the formation of Australian representative constitutions in later years. The rapid growth of so powerful a class, practically holding every known territory, necessitated the 'issue of various 'squattling regulations' from time to time. By these, the squatter was to hold his run under a yearly licence; he was to be limited to the possession of one single run, proportioned in extent to the number of his stock—a regulation, however, which was notoriously set at nought, many persons holding several runs in various districts, and all

runs being vastly larger than the amount of stock on them absolutely required. He was also to pay a yearly licence-fee of 10*l.*—a merely nominal sum, as, in many instances, it did not amount to the tithe of a farthing per acre. Indeed, the liberality with which the public domain was appropriated to this, the only landholding class, was extravagant in the extreme. It was asserted that ten acres were necessary to the support of each sheep; and, though it has since been abundantly demonstrated that sheep can thrive on less than one acre per head, yet instances were rare indeed in which the squatter had not a very ample margin for the future multiplication of his flocks. When it is borne in mind that the squatter numbers his sheep by fifties and even hundreds of thousands, some idea may be formed of the vast principalities passing under the humble appellation of 'runs.'

Yet the squatters were by no means satisfied with their many advantages, and their efforts with the Imperial Government to obtain more firm possession of the public domain were unceasing. They complained that their tenure was insecure—that they were denied the ordinary advantages of traders and capitalists in pledging their holdings as security in the purchase of stock, the raising of loans, and other means of improving the position of themselves and the Australian colonies—that they had no inducement to execute various desirable improvements on their runs—and that they were even debarred from developing the agricultural and mineral resources of the land.\* These arguments, skilfully and persistently urged, were not without their effect on the Home Government, and at length, in 1846, resulted, to the astonishment of the Australian Colonies, and somewhat to the surprise of the squatters themselves, in the famous Orders in Council. These Orders may be summed up in two most important concessions to the squatters. Their tenure from year to year was to be changed into Crown leases of fourteen years' duration, renewable at the option of the Colonial Governors—which meant, of course, their own option; and they were to possess a Pre-emptive Right entitling them to purchase the fee-simple of the whole or any portion of their 'runs' at the fixed price of 1*l.* per acre. It is almost unnecessary to draw attention to the immense importance of these changes. Virtually, they handed over the Australian Colonies to a mere handful of gentlemen farmers. Yet the Home Government

---

\* For a more detailed enumeration of the arguments of the squatters, see 'Petition to Queen and Parliament of Pastoral Association of New South Wales 1844.'

was not without its show of argument against the charge of a too ready compliance. Wool had become the staple commodity of the Australian Colonies, and wool-growers were, beyond dispute, the leading and most successful class of colonists. Commissions (unfortunately for the argument, appointed by squatters and composed of squatters) had pronounced the Australian lands unfit for any other purpose, 'and not worth the smallest coin 'in the realm per acre.' It was, too, carefully kept from the knowledge of the British Ministers that the claims of the squatters had already begun to excite strong indignation among their fellow-colonists, whom they hemmed in within a few towns, and whose want of success they turned into a very plausible argument in their own favour. But, above all, the gold, which was to mark a new era in the world's settlement, still lay undisturbed in the Californian millstream.

Yet we cannot but think that even then the Australian Colonies promised a brighter future than the Home Government thus marked out for them. So certainly it appeared to the Australian Governors, who received these Orders in Council with dismay, and hesitated from month to month ere they issued the fourteen years' leases which their tenor imposed upon them. Indeed, these leases have never been issued up to the present day, though the terms of the Orders leave no doubt but that the squatters were legally entitled to them. More mature reflection and personal inquiry convinced the Governors that their issue, without any sufficient provision for the growing wants of the agricultural and small-farmer class, would raise a storm of opposition, if not an actual rebellion, throughout their vice-royalties; and while they temporised with the squatters, and expostulated, in a necessarily tedious correspondence, with the Home Government, the Californian discoveries of 1849 took place, and were followed by Mr. Hargreave's announcement of gold on Bathurst Plains. Of the thousands who daily poured into the ports of Sydney and Melbourne — most, indeed, to dig for gold, but all with some ulterior hope of obtaining that desire of the human breast, a freehold home — few were prepared for the astounding discovery that the whole of the Australian Colonies were held in firm possession by the squatters and their flocks. The discovery, when it was made, was not without imminent danger to the peace and order of that portion of the British Empire; though it is no small proof of the fitness of the Australian colonists for their most liberal powers of self-government, that the long and tedious struggle on which they then entered has been conducted on strictly constitutional principles. Gold-digging, though not unprofit-

able during its earlier years, was soon found to be a laborious and peculiarly comfortless employment. Thousands of diggers, who had saved some two or three hundred pounds apiece at the mines, sought to purchase farms and to become permanent colonists. But there was no land to be had. Many left the shores of Australia, and obtained what they sought under the more fortunate land-laws of the United States of America. Many drank themselves to death. Many listened to the windy orators who harangued them from every stump and market-place, and overlooked bad grammar and worse logic in a keen sense of their own injury. The efforts of the various new representative Colonial Parliaments were incessant to remedy so unsatisfactory a state of things. Land Bill after Land Bill was introduced, discussed, and quashed. Ministry after Ministry took the helm, and abandoned it in despair. The 'squattling members' in the House (whose constituencies consisted of little more than themselves and their shepherds) insisted on the fulfilment of 'their rights;' the anti-squatters insisted that hanging was too good for them. It is almost incredible that the fourteen years originally named in the Orders in Council dragged their slow length along without one single Land Bill for the sale and settlement of the waste lands of the colonies making its way successfully through any one of the new Colonial Parliaments. In the meantime the various Executives did almost nothing, hoping that each proposed measure would confer on them more ample powers. The original land regulations did, indeed, enable the Governor to enter on a squatter's run *for public purposes*; and this provision was made use of in the construction of roads and townships, and, though to a much more limited extent, in the proclamation of building and suburban allotments opened for public sale. Miserable as was the dribble of land which this occasionally brought into the market, its benefits were much restricted. The squatter could always avail himself of his pre-emptive right, if he had the money. And, where the land came into the market, the Government were strictly obliged to sell by auction, at an upset price not lower than 1*l*. per acre. Practically, therefore, pre-emptive right, competition, and the extreme hesitation with which Government availed itself of a provision by no means clearly worded (and, indeed, pressing most unequally on individual squatters), raised the price of building and suburban allotments to extravagant amounts, and all but excluded small farms and country homesteads from the soil. The position of the Australian colonists during those years, more especially as regards the great centres of population assembled on the various gold-fields of New South

Wales and Victoria, was most unsatisfactory. In a country practically boundless in its supply of excellent land, the gold-field's digger, shopkeeper, or mechanic could not obtain the smallest patch to cultivate a few vegetables for himself or his family; and if his horse strayed a few yards from his tent, it was impounded by the neighbouring squatter.

But, indeed, these evils were not by any means restricted to more crowded localities, but spread themselves throughout the whole of the Australian Colonies. And, to confine ourselves more particularly to the colony of Queensland, we extract the following remarks of Dr. Lang, suggested during a visit made to some of its districts most favoured by nature, no longer ago than 1856. They will serve to show that these evils had already extended themselves to territories whose vast extent would seem to set all land difficulties at defiance.

‘One should have thought that, with so numerous a population as there has been for so many years past on the Lower Richmond and North Arm, some interest would have been taken by a paternal Government [that of New South Wales, Queensland being then its Moreton Bay dependency] in their welfare, and some efforts made for their social advancement. Here were hundreds of people, many of them earning for years together from 5*l.* to 7*l.* a week, and not a few of them with wives and children, leading a sort of vagabond life, like gipsies, in this naturally rich district. Surely, in such circumstances, the first duty of a government would have been to provide these people with the first requisite of civilisation—a home—by laying off townships for them in suitable localities, and holding out to them the opportunity of purchasing town and suburban allotments, and of thereby settling themselves as reputable and industrious citizens, bringing up their families like a civilised and Christian people. A surveyor might have done all this in a few months, and his surveys of particular towns and villages might easily have been wrought into a more general survey at any time thereafter. What, then, will be thought of the absentee Government of the Richmond River District when I state it as a positive fact that up to the period of my visit to the Richmond River, in the month of August, 1856, there had never been one town or suburban allotment sold on the river? Land for purchase had been applied for, both by squatters under their pre-emptive rights, and by the better class of cedar-cutters, for many years past; but to no purpose. Not one town allotment was sold, not one acre of land was measured, for years and years in succession! And what has been the consequence? Why, hundreds of people who would gladly have purchased town allotments and built good houses for their families if they could, and hundreds of others who would have purchased small portions of land to rear a few head of cattle or a horse or two for their households, were denied every opportunity of doing so, and, as their only resource in the circumstances, were driven perforce to the public-house, to



expend their earnings there in riotous dissipation, and to reduce their wives and families to misery and ruin. Cases of this kind—of cedar-cutters who had saved up one, two, three, and even five hundred pounds, and who in a fit of desperation had spent the whole of it in the public-house—were mentioned to me as having been of frequent occurrence; and a respectable inhabitant of the district mentioned to me the case of a person who had saved up eight hundred pounds in this way, and had spent the whole of it at one bout of frenzied dissipation, simply because he could get no opportunity of purchasing even a town allotment in the district, and because the squatter on whose run he had erected his hut had been threatening to dispossess him as a trespasser.'

We are happy to state that, owing to more improved land regulations, to which we shall presently revert, no less than four townships have been thrown open within this district on the Lower Richmond, and, under a more healthy system, we may naturally expect it to assume those evidences of progress so favourably described by Sir George Bowen in his late visit to the Darling Downs, as already transferred to our pages. Indeed, more generally, our task in thus sketching this curious episode in the history of Australian colonisation would be but an ungracious one were we not also able to add the steps which are now being taken to bring the squatter element within more moderate bounds, and to facilitate the more permanent settlement of all classes on the lands. To the new Parliament of Queensland is due the merit of having first carried a Land Bill successfully through its several stages. The new Land Act of Queensland, or rather Acts (for the whole subject affecting the occupation and purchase of Crown lands is dealt with in four separate measures), received the royal assent in September, 1860. And, as the example of Queensland was soon followed by similar measures of the other Australian Parliaments, it may not be uninteresting to examine the position of 'the Land Question,' at the present moment, throughout the Australian continent. It will be borne in mind that all Acts of the parent colony of New South Wales are in force throughout each Australian colony until repealed by its own Parliament; and also that, under the Constitution granted to each of these colonies, the Crown transferred all ownership in the soil to the colonists themselves. In using the term 'Crown lands,' therefore, we apply the shortest, as hitherto the more general name, to all Australian soil undiscovered, lying absolutely waste, or occupied by squatters, in contradistinction to all portions of the public domain already sold, or otherwise alienated, to private individuals. We may also state that, while the extreme squatter party demanded the complete fulfilment of the Orders in Council, the extreme opposite party of anti-squatters insisted on the

right of all colonists to free selection from Crown lands *prior* to their actual survey by the Government, at a fixed price per acre. These remarks may enable the reader to see with what success the several colonies have now endeavoured to steer a mean course between two parties which, for some years, comprehended almost every Australian colonist.

The chief features of the Queensland Acts may be thus summed up. The Orders in Council are repealed. All land open for purchase must be *previously* surveyed, and delineated on the public maps of the colony. The auction system, with its upset price of 1*l.* per acre, is still allowed to be in force. But—and here is the distinguishing feature of these regulations—from the auction system are excluded certain agricultural reserves, which the Government is to proclaim in all suitable places, at its discretion—with a guarantee, however, that half the extent of each reserve shall be continuously kept in excess of the demand; such reserves being, of course, proclaimed over runs, waste lands, and generally wheresoever population may show a tendency to extend itself. On these reserves the intending settler may *purchase* farms of from 40 to 320 acres, at a fixed price of 1*l.* per acre; the purchaser of each farm being allowed to *rent* a contiguous allotment of three times its extent at 6*d.* per acre, with right to purchase such allotment, at 1*l.* per acre, within five years. In general, therefore, the agricultural farmer can rent land at something equivalent to 5*s.* per acre, and purchase it at 1*l.* per acre. Subject to these chances of dispossession, the squatters are thus dealt with. Squatters actually in occupation shall obtain leases of five years' duration, at a yearly rent to be fixed by valuation. Where such valuation is objected to, the vacated run is to be let to the highest bidder at public auction, the new lessee paying over (through the medium of the Treasury) to the outgoing occupant the value of all actual and real improvements, under Government appraisement. Squatters taking up new runs, in outlying or unexplored districts, are to be allowed leases of fourteen years' duration. These new runs are not to be less than 25 square miles, nor greater than 100 square miles in extent, and they are to be subjected to the yearly rent of 10*s.* per square mile (640 acres) for the first four years, with a slight increase during the succeeding years. As a strong counterbalance, however, the squatters lose all power of pre-emptive right, which is now wholly abolished within the colony of Queensland. Besides these provisions for the agricultural classes, each immigrant, unless arriving at the expense of the colony, receives a land order entitling him to a free grant of 30 acres. British soldiers

and sailors are also entitled to land orders of 50 acres apiece; and commissioned officers of the British army and navy continue to receive the same remission (one-third) of purchase-money originally established under the old colony of New South Wales, but since abolished in it and its other offshoots.

The neighbouring colonies of New South Wales and Victoria succeeded in passing nearly similar Acts shortly afterwards. The colony of South Australia had, with her foundation, introduced a somewhat more liberal land system; while the exodus which took place from her territories during the earlier period of the gold discoveries relieved her from all pressure for some years. More lately, the large tracts thrown open within her boundaries by recent explorations have given a very considerable impetus to squatting pursuits; and the South Australian squatter still continues, to a great extent, to enjoy, with the free consent of his fellow-colonists, the easy regulations of the old colony of New South Wales, ere 'Free Selection before Survey' came to be agitated by its landless classes. The colony of Western Australia, however, stands alone for its rigid maintenance of the squatting system in all its early arrogance, and this huge wilderness, with an area of a million square miles, and its handful of squatters and their convict stockmen, still continues to be locked up to all intending purchasers.

To sum up, then, the present position of the land question throughout the whole of these colonies. The upset price of land has been maintained at 1*l.* per acre throughout the whole continent.\* The auction system has been abolished throughout New South Wales, Victoria, and, practically, in Queensland; and the intending purchaser is subject to no competition. In these colonies, a supply of agricultural land, probably sufficient for several years to come, is now placed in the market. The tendency of legislation has been (1) to exact from the squatters a return, in the shape of rent, or assessment on stock, more commensurate with the value of their runs; and (2) to confer on them a security of tenure increasing with their distance from the chief centres of population. Both these elements are conducing to the occupancy of large tracts of more distant and unexplored country by this class of settlers; and, generally, the termination of this long strife appears to have given a very considerable stimulus to squatting pursuits, while relieving the more crowded districts of their pressure. Thus a method of relief, while doubtless pressing with great and unequal severity on individual

\* In the United States it is a dollar; in Canada from two to six shillings; in New Zealand ten shillings.

squatters whose runs happen to come within the compass of lands proclaimed for sale, is not without its advantage in giving increased attraction to outlying districts, and in thus conducing to interior colonisation by these pioneers of Australian settlement.

Descending now from these vast table-lands, we shall endeavour briefly to place before the reader the results of late explorations within the tract lying between the western slope of this elevated plateau and the 138th meridian (the western boundary of the colony), forming the third and last portion of Queensland territory. Our late review of Australian Exploration\* will have enabled our readers to follow in the course of the incessant efforts—under Sturt, Mitchell, Leichhardt, and Gregory—of which this and the more western regions, forming Central Australia, have been the field, concluding with the simultaneous expeditions of Mr. Stuart and Messrs. Burke and Wills. Immediately after the return of Mr. Stuart, the three colonies of South Australia, Victoria, and Queensland, alarmed for the safety of Messrs. Burke and Wills, despatched three independent expeditions in search of them. Mr. Walker's party started from Port Curtis, and, crossing over the Great Coast Range, entered the tract we are now examining, and successfully crossed through to the shores of the Gulf of Carpentaria. Mr. Landsborough, about the same time, left the shores of the Gulf, and, descending through the whole of the tract, reached its southern boundary in June, 1862. And Mr. McKinlay, starting from the north of the Torrens Basin, entered it from the south-west, and was equally successful in effecting a northern passage, returning in the following August. Thus, strangely enough, a region which for years had defied the attacks of such persistent and daring explorers as Sturt, Mitchell, and Leichhardt, was crossed, almost simultaneously, by no less than five separate and wholly independent routes. More strangely, and more lamentably, ere any of the searching parties had left their starting-points, Messrs. Burke and Wills had already solved the great problem of crossing the continent, and had returned to their dépôt to find it abandoned by those they had left in charge of it. The information collected by these three searching parties will, of course, need much further addition ere we can learn the more full capabilities of this large tract of country; but there is already sufficient to guide us to a rough sketch. It is certain that Sturt's desert does not extend much further than his extreme point in 1845 (lat. 26°), and that in its immediate

---

\* Edinburgh Review, No. cccxxv., July, 1862.

vicinity there are numerous and apparently permanent freshwater lakes. And though worthless tracts of country occasionally recur—in far smaller, however, and less rude patches—yet the whole territory promises to be a valuable addition to the pastoral regions of the continent, interspersed even with excellent agricultural districts. None of it would appear to attain to the elevation of the table-lands on the summit of the Coast Range, though the mean depression of the interior is by no means so low as had been previously supposed, and is considerably relieved by the occurrence of short, and apparently unconnected, ranges of hills. If a conjecture might be hazarded, in the present supply of information, we should attribute the gradual formation of this whole tract of country to the action of the numerous streams descending down the western slope of the Great Coast Range, and depositing portions of its detached soil on an original foundation of sandy desert. Indeed, Sturt himself regarded his Stony Desert as the vast bed of some watercourse, filled at certain seasons of the year with a torrent so strong as to carry all detritus over its natural pavement, and to deposit it further in the interior. The Mud and Clay Plains, and tracts ‘resembling boundless ploughed fields on which floods had settled and subsided,’ would seem to indicate portions of this territory more slow in their formation. Each stream and rivulet, too, when followed down, was found to expend itself on wide grassy plains, while its banks, raised high above the surrounding country, served to show its method of protruding itself through the soil. Indeed, the distance to which some of those streams have crept into the interior is wonderful, considering how frequently they exhibit every indication of exhaustion. The Victoria, or Cooper’s Creek, has been followed for 1,500 miles; and though it reaches at length within a few miles of the sea, it does not effect any junction with it; and some of the fertilised districts which it leaves behind it in its course are of very considerable extent. As an immense network of streams descends into the interior down the slopes of the Coast Range, and as no outlet has hitherto been discovered, the evaporation must be enormous. But, indeed, the whole of this extensive tract presents many subjects of curious inquiry. At present, we must rest satisfied with the assurance that it contains many large districts suitable for the pasturing of sheep and cattle; and that, should the squatter ever have to retire from the vast table-lands of the Great Coast Range, we may here calculate on new and extensive fields for the growth of wool. With which, we may here conclude our geographical sketch of Queensland territory.

With these numerous and varied advantages of soil and climate, we should feel fully justified in anticipating for this young colony a great and distinguished position among the new settlements of the globe. They combine, indeed, almost every natural facility that is to be found within the temperate and tropical zones with a fertility and readiness of adaptation which seem peculiar to the Australian continent. But we have not yet brought the account to a close. It is not at all improbable but that Queensland may, in addition, help us to the solution of a social problem of great and pressing importance. It is asserted that SUGAR, TOBACCO, and COTTON, the three great slave-grown articles of commerce, can be safely and profitably cultivated by Europeans on these shores of the Pacific; and when we consider the very large extent of territory lying within the influence of the Great Coast Range, said to be free from the evils of other tropical and semi-tropical climates, the statement is not unworthy of careful examination.

With respect to salubrity, the case would appear to stand greatly in favour of Queensland. Queensland and Egypt occupy similar positions respectively on the southern and northern tropics; but while the Valley of the Nile necessarily presents a concave surface, the whole eastern coast of Australia is convex throughout its extent, the greater portion of territory lying some 2,000 feet above sea-level. This elevation greatly moderates the heat of the tropical sun, while the surface of the soil is further cooled by a very large rainfall, reaching as high as forty-three inches annually (or nearly double that of London), and by the prevalence of cool sea-breezes during the night. Notwithstanding these advantages, however, the midday heat of the sun is somewhat unpleasantly warm, during the summer months, for field labour. No injurious effects, however, have as yet been traced to it. Indeed, the entire work of the colony—almost wholly, of course, out-of-door work—and of the Moreton Bay settlement while for many years it was a dependency of New South Wales, has been carried on by Europeans without the least appearance of unhealthy results. On this subject, Dr. Lang writes:—

‘In regard to the ability of Europeans generally to stand field labour of any kind with impunity in the climate of Queensland, I was enabled, from having visited Moreton Bay repeatedly in the months of November and December, the hottest season of the year, to form a pretty correct judgment on the subject from my own feelings and observation. At that season, therefore, I found European carpenters, bricklayers, and other handicraftsmen, whose occupations required them to be much in the sun, pursuing their accustomed

labours just as they do in Sydney. On conversing with some of them who had been for years in New South Wales, they told me they knew no difference in the climate, as far as their ability to pursue their usual occupations was concerned, from that of Sydney and Hunter's River; while others admitted that they felt it hot at first, but soon got used to it, and the heat did them no harm. I found a respectable farmer's sons regularly at the plough, whenever the weather, which was very much broken at the time from the commencement of the rains, permitted them, in the middle of December; and they told me they could work as freely and with quite as little risk in the open air at their station, in latitude  $27^{\circ}$ , as they could in any part of the old colony.'

To which we may add the following testimony of Dr. Barton, House-Surgeon of the Brisbane Hospital and Meteorological Observer to the Queensland Government:—

'The climate of this colony is salubrious and very favourable to the European constitution. Persons, particularly, who have arrived at or passed the middle age in the more inhospitable climate of Britain, often have their health and vigour surprisingly renewed in this genial climate. Instances of persons arriving at great age are common, persons nearly or quite one hundred years old being not unfrequently met with, and these generally retaining an amount of strength and activity to the last.'

Indeed, as a more general testimony of the salubrity of the Australian Colonies, we give the subjoined illustration of the mean average mortality of bodies of men subject to the same duties, discipline, and regulations. The mean average mortality of British troops has now stood for several years at 10 per cent. in some of the West India Islands; in Jamaica, it reaches as high as 143 per 1,000; while, throughout the Australian stations, it falls as low as 15 per 1,000. While, therefore, field work is not unaccompanied with some personal inconvenience during midday of the summer months, especially to immigrants more newly arrived within the colony, there would appear to be an entire absence of any more serious or detrimental effects on the European frame, such tax on the constitution being amply compensated for by cool nights, and the dry and bracing character of the atmosphere.

Nor are the soil and climate of the colony less favourable to the growth of these articles of commerce than to human life. Indeed, tobacco is an indigenous product of the Australian continent, plants of great luxuriance being found along the banks of some of the New South Wales rivers, as also in Queensland. Its cultivation has already been tried to some extent in Queensland, and the manufactured product has been

pronounced superior to the American article. Similar experiments have been tried on the sugar-cane, on a somewhat more extended scale. On the Clarence River, two degrees south of Brisbane, the canes have yielded four tons of sugar to the acre. At Brisbane itself, three tons have been procured from the acre; and at Cleveland, a regular sugar plantation, containing fifteen acres, is now on the point of maturity. But as settlement will advance to Wide Bay, Port Curtis, and Rockhampton, it is anticipated that these more tropical regions will be found, even better adapted to its successful cultivation, for which they possess extensive tracts of suitable soil.

Before, however, examining the fitness of Queensland for the cultivation of the third and most important product of coloured labour, it may be as well to say a few words on the general competition of white labour with coloured labour, as bearing on the profitable cultivation of sugar and tobacco. Doubtless, at first view, the impression arises that the employer of white labour is unfairly matched against negro or coolie competition. Hitherto it has been exceedingly difficult to bring the matter to a practical test. In colder latitudes, it is true, no description of African or Asiatic labour has ever been able to maintain ground against European competition; but then, it may be argued, these races are unable to withstand the rigour of the North. On the other hand, a European out-of-door labourer in the Southern States of America, the West Indies, the Mauritius, Ceylon, or India, would be worth little or nothing to his employer, and would most certainly undermine his own health. Perhaps the gold-mining Australian colonies offer the nearest example of a fair test. There are now about 100,000 Chinese on the gold-fields of Victoria and New South Wales, all quite willing to hire themselves out as labourers at wages far below the European rate. Yet, though the European rate is as high as 3*l.* and 4*l.* per week, and though mining operations are, of late years, almost all conducted by means of hired labour, it is a most rare occurrence to find a Chinese in European employment, and then only in some light and subsidiary occupation. They are to some greater extent employed by the Victorian and New South Wales farmers and squatters for shepherds and farm-servants, though this arises chiefly from the scarcity of European labour in the country districts; and at harvest-time Europeans are procured at any price. These Chinese are short, stout, active men, temperate in their habits, intelligent, and greedy of English money. They are capable of a much greater amount of sustained labour than either negroes or coolies, yet their influence on the European labour-market



is scarcely appreciable. These and other instances afford a strong presumption that free, well-fed, high-priced English labour is, under fair circumstances of competition, more profitable to the employer than nominally cheap African and Asiatic labour.\* It is certain, too, that coloured labour has been unfavourable to the introduction and development of machinery, the most profitable of all labour. Indeed, this receives a curious illustration in the case of the sugar-cane. No two processes could be kept more perfectly distinct than those of cane-growing and sugar-making. Excluding the requirements of coloured labour, there is no more necessity for combining them than for combining on one farm the business of the wheat-grower, the miller, and the baker. The economy resulting from a division of labour in this case has been repeatedly urged on the planters of the West Indies and the Mauritius; but as coloured labour, to be rendered available, must be kept uninterruptedly employed, the sugar-grower is still obliged to be alternately a farmer and a manufacturer. In the Brazils, too, the process of sugar-making has not advanced beyond the rudest application of the water-wheel and hand-labour, though a more economical system of steam machinery is quite as applicable to cane-crushing and sugar-refining as to corn-grinding and sifting. Queensland seems peculiarly fitted for the production of this great article of commerce on more advantageous principles. The cane has been found to thrive excellently in the immense tract lying between the Pacific and the Coast Range: indeed, a larger and, it is asserted, a more profitable description of cane is indigenous to some of the islands off the coast, and can be procured with little difficulty. The small farmer can grow his 'cane patch' with less outlay of time and money than is expended on a similar plot of wheat or potatoes, the roots lasting for several years, and nothing being necessary beyond an occasional hoeing until the shoots are cut in October. Here it is possible, as it is certainly desirable, that his labours should cease as a sugar-maker—the uninterrupted succession of the seasons, as the various productions of temperate and tropical zones come to maturity, enabling him to combine cane-growing with other agricultural pursuits. With a sufficient supply of such cane-growers, pri-

\* The reader, too, who would more generally follow out the sturdy, dogged, beef-eating English labourer in his competition with other *European* labour, will find much to interest him in Mr. Senior's excellent treatise on Political Economy, under the heading of 'Average Rates of Wages,' and more especially in the evidence collected by Parliamentary committees and quoted there.

vate enterprise would quickly establish sugar-mills; the Australian colonist being no whit behind the Yankee in his love of 'speculation,' and the quantity of money lying in the Australian banks, and awaiting 'openings,' being unprecedentedly large in proportion to the population. Not to talk of the immense European trade in this article, the 1,200,000 Australians—themselves great consumers of sugar—would afford no bad market at starting. The ordinary 'rations,' issued to all shepherds, stockmen, and 'Bush hands,' throughout these colonies, includes three pounds of sugar per week; and if we suppose it to be not much above the ordinary consumption, which affluence has made somewhat extravagant, there is already a local demand of close on 100,000 tons annually. The reader will find some further information on this subject in Dr. Lang's work; and we shall here conclude with his remark on the separate erection of sugar-mills as a profitable undertaking:—'In short, I am quite confident there is no speculation which at this moment would be attended with less risk, or would offer a more certain prospect of success, than the one of which I have thus sketched out the details.'

Nearly similar remarks will apply to indigo (also indigenous soil\*), arrow-root, tea, coffee, ginger, all of which have already tried in Queensland, and found to thrive remarkably well. Indeed, with regard to almost all the productions of slave labour, and those from which the nature of tropical climates has hitherto excluded Europeans, it may be confidently asserted that an opportunity is now offered in Queensland of bringing white labour into competition for the markets of Europe, under peculiarly promising, and, indeed, elsewhere unattainable, conditions. With regard to tea, the Director of the Queensland Botanical Gardens, in his Annual Report, dated July, 1862, writes:—'This experiment, in connexion with the tea plant, is the largest which has been made in any of the Australian Colonies. The result proves the perfect adaptation of our soil and climate to the successful cultivation of this product.'

But curiosity with regard to this very important experiment

---

\* Indeed, the indigo plant would have furnished us with an equally curious illustration of the rude and elementary state in which coloured labour keeps machinery, and mechanical appliances in general. The Indian coolie still descends up to his neck in the indigo vat, and tritulates and stirs up the heavier portions from the bottom by the action of his feet, though there can scarcely be a doubt but that, under white labour, steam machinery could be brought to bear on the process in a quicker and cheaper manner.

will, at the present moment, naturally centre itself in COTTON. And it may not be uninteresting to the reader to lay before him the actual prospects of Queensland as a field for its production. It had been ascertained for several years that a variety of the cotton plant, known as the Sea Island cotton, was capable of being cultivated with great success in the Moreton Bay settlement: indeed, this variety of cotton, if not indigenous to the Australian continent, as there is reason to suppose, is found in great luxuriance on some of the islands adjoining the mainland. It was also ascertained that the shrubs continued to improve up to their third and fourth year after planting, thereby effecting a considerable saving over the American plantations, where they are obliged to be renewed every year. Samples of this cotton were, from time to time, and as early as 1846, submitted to Manchester firms, and were most highly spoken of, their market value being estimated at from 1s. to 1s. 3d. and even 2s. per pound—the common ‘New Orleans’ variety then fetching about 5d. But it was not until 1858 that Australian cotton made its appearance in Liverpool as an article of commerce. It then realised 1s. 9d. per pound.

‘I saw at once,’ says Mr. Bazley, M.P. for Manchester, in a speech delivered on the subject of cotton-growth, ‘that, with such vastly superior cotton, yarn could be produced finer than any that could be manufactured in India or Great Britain. I bought that cotton, carried it to Manchester, and spun it into exquisitely fine yarn. I found that the weavers of Lancashire could not produce a fabric from it, it was so exceedingly delicate; the weavers of Scotland could not weave it; nor could even the manufacturers of France weave this yarn into fine muslin. It occurred to me to send it to Calcutta, and in due time I had the happiness of receiving from India some of the finest muslin ever manufactured, the product of the skill of the Hindoos with this delicate Australian cotton.’

Small consignments of this cotton continued during succeeding years to arrive in England; and at the International Exhibition of 1862, no less than seven medals were awarded to Queensland growers, while the distinction of ‘honourable mention’ was conferred on five more. In a Report of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce on these exhibited samples, it is remarked—‘The samples of Sea Island cotton from the Australian colonies are far superior to cotton from any other part of the world.’

Incited by such testimonies as to the excellence of Queensland cotton, the colonists have taken vigorous steps to place a large quantity of land under cotton, and the Colonial Government have further encouraged its growth by offering a bonus

of 10*l*. (issued as a land-order) on every bale of Sea Island cotton, weighing 300 lbs., grown within the colony, and of 5*l*. on the coarser varieties. The following is, as nearly as can be estimated, the total quantity of land placed under cotton crop, down to the 31st of December, 1862:—The Cabulture Cotton Company, on the Cabulture River, 150 acres under crop; on the Logan, 1,280 acres prepared, of which 150 are under crop; the English Company (Mr. Bazley's), on Nerang Creek, 2,000 acres, of which 100 just sown; several smaller companies on the Logan River, amount planted not stated; Victorian Company, on the Hotham River, 3,000 acres, 1,000 ready for sowing; Ipswich Cotton Company, 150 acres under crop; the Maryborough Cotton-growing Association, 35 acres under crop; several small private growers around Ipswich, 300 acres under crop; at Port Curtis, some plantations under crop, amount not stated. In addition to these, a large number of companies are now forming, and several private farmers are adding a few acres of cotton to their ordinary crops.

Of these new plantations, the first bales have already reached Liverpool from the Ipswich cotton-growers, and will naturally give increased activity to the movement. The cotton has realised 3*s*. per pound, and produced 323 lbs. to the acre. The result, including sale of cotton, cotton-seed, and land-orders, shows a clear profit of 43*l*. 11*s*. 6*d*. on ten acres of land, according to a return published in the Queensland newspapers. Mr. Panton, the chief of these Ipswich cotton-growers, estimates that the total expenses may be brought within 10*l*. per acre. One able-bodied man can keep ten acres in cultivation, and, with the assistance of some of the junior members of his family, can gather in the crop. The picking season ranges between May, June, and July (the Australian winter), when the weather is almost invariably fine, and the climate cool. Under present circumstances, the return we have just given, showing a clear profit of over 40*l*. per acre, and enabling an ordinary labouring man to realise an income of 43*l*. 11*s*. 6*d*., does not appear an exceptional one. There are, however, some material deductions to be made for future years. The local demand for cotton seed, which is produced in the ratio of 11 oz. of seed to 4 oz. of cotton, may be expected to decline. The 10*l*. land-orders on each bale of cotton will be reduced to half that amount at the end of three years, and cease altogether at the end of five. And the present high price of cotton is exceptional; though not to such an amount in the case of this Sea Island variety as might at first sight be thought. The Sea Island cotton, as grown in the Southern States, has

hitherto, before the outbreak of the American civil war, commanded prices ranging from 1s. 6d. to 2s. per pound; while all testimony goes to prove the superior excellence of the Queensland growth. Indeed, some of the samples we have already mentioned as shown at the London Exhibition were valued as high as 4s. 6d. per pound, though what share the present abnormal state of the cotton market had in this calculation we are not aware. Even at this price, its annual consumption, in normal years, amounts to about 47,150 bags, or, at 400 lbs. to the bag, 18,860,000 lbs. In America, however, as well as in Egypt, it has been found not nearly so prolific as the coarser descriptions, to which it has greatly given place—'New Orleans' cotton, at 6d. per pound, being considered a more remunerative crop than 'Sea Island' at 1s. 6d., or even 2s., unless under peculiarly favourable circumstances. This defect in the Sea Island cotton is, it is stated, on authority which we have no reason to doubt, in a great degree obviated in Queensland, where it is said to be capable of a production little, if at all, inferior to the coarser descriptions of America. Indeed, the return we have just given, exhibiting a return of 323 lbs. per acre, fully bears out these anticipations—the produce of the Sea Island variety in America seldom averaging higher than 225 lbs., and this only on particular plantations; while Mr. Panton, and other Queensland growers, speak confidently of raising the produce to 400 lbs. Its superior excellence, moreover, will enable it to command the market.

Doubtless our readers will have already seen that Queensland cotton-growing, in its present phase, promises no solution of the Lancashire problem—cotton at 3s., or even 1s., affording little hope of taking the place of the hitherto all but universal sixpenny 'short staple;' though, under the data we have just sketched, the colonists and their Government have, in their own interests, given no undue preference to the Sea Island variety. However, even on the extreme—though, to all appearance, not unlikely—supposition that Queensland should wholly displace the finer varieties of cotton hitherto in the market, the comparatively small amount of 50,000 acres under crop would oblige her to resort to new tactics—an amount which, in the continuance of the present rapidly increasing movement, may shortly be expected. In the meantime, her prospects of engaging in the coarser descriptions are by no means unfavourable. So early as 1852, Queensland samples of the New Orleans variety were submitted to the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, and after careful examination by its President—the present member for Manchester—

were valued at 5½*d.*—a trifle over the ruling price of 'short staple' American cotton of similar kind. Some of the samples, too, shown at the late International Exhibition were of the New Orleans variety, and in the Report to the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, drawn up by Mr. Wanklyn, we find the following remark on them:—'I do not desire in the least to discourage the cultivation of Sea Island cotton, but the samples of New Orleans are so particularly good, that I would recommend the Queensland people to try both the New Orleans and the Egyptian, for it is quite possible that the return per acre of those sorts may be even more profitable than Sea Island.' From the few specimens of the coarser varieties already grown in the colony, the more experienced planters anticipate a yield of 600 lbs. per acre, which is somewhat in excess of the ordinary American crop. And, indeed, considering the wonderful luxuriance which almost all introduced plants and shrubs have attained to under Queensland soil and climate, it is not unreasonable to suppose that other and coarser varieties of the cotton-tree may be found to exhibit a fertility corresponding to that which has brought into favour the Sea Island cotton. The latter and finer species would then be speedily displaced by the kinds for which there is the largest demand, as has already happened in the Southern States of America, Egypt, and other long-established cotton countries.

On every account, from its vast extent, from its fertile soil, from its delicious climate, from its extensive seaboard and abundant watercourses, from its judicious institutions, and from the wise and temperate spirit which has hitherto prevailed in its administration, Queensland deserves to be regarded as one of the most interesting and promising of those youthful States with which the maritime and colonial genius of England has studded the globe. Seven years have not yet elapsed since the province of Moreton Bay assumed the rank of an independent colony. The terms of service of its first Governor, Sir George Bowen, and of its first Minister, Mr. Herbert, have not yet expired: but these accomplished and fortunate rulers have already founded a State which cannot fail to rank amongst the freest and most prosperous communities on the face of the earth.

ART. II.—*Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter, vom fünften Jahrhundert bis zum sechzehnten Jahrhundert.* Von FERDINAND GREGOROVIVS. Vols. I.—IV. Stuttgart: 1859—1862.

IN a well-known passage of his autobiography, Gibbon has recorded to us how the first idea of his immortal work presented itself to his mind as he sat ‘musing amidst the ruins of the Capitol, while the barefooted friars were singing vespers in the Temple of Jupiter.’ But his original plan, as he himself adds, ‘was circumscribed to the decay of the city rather than of the empire,’ and it was only by degrees that his views expanded so as to comprise the whole extent of the more important subject. No one certainly will regret the change, to which we are indebted for the greatest historical work of modern times. But there are some readers who will have felt that the original object of his aspirations has been too much lost sight of in the progress of the more extensive plan; or rather that the proportions to which the history of the city was necessarily reduced in order to keep it in due subordination to the main design, did not allow of its receiving so full a developement as it deserved. The concluding chapter of Gibbon’s history contains indeed a masterly sketch of the decay of the city itself, and the causes which gradually reduced it to the condition in which it is described to us by Poggio Bracciolini in the fifteenth century; while the revolutions and fortunes of Rome, though occupying but a small place in the more extended picture after the fall of the Western Empire, are traced out in bold and vigorous outlines from the time of Alaric to that of Nicholas V.

It is not too much to say that whatever may be gleaned by the industry of later students in this field will do little more than fill up the outlines already drawn by the master-hand of Gibbon; but the task is not the less a desirable one, and one that has remained too long unfulfilled. Every one who, like Gibbon himself, has visited the ruins of Rome and mused over their vicissitudes—and who is there at the present day that has *not* been at Rome?—must have felt that there was a great chasm in his associations with the scenes around him—that between the period of their imperial splendour, and that of their renewed magnificence under the Popes of the sixteenth century, there was a long interval with which he was comparatively unfamiliar: he will have desired to trace in more detail the progress

of the varied changes that swept over the city in the course of a thousand years, that gradually raised up a new Rome in the place of the old one, and established the 'barefooted friars' on the ruins of the Capitol.

To supply the deficiency thus existing in historical literature is the task that M. Gregorovius has proposed to himself in the volumes now before us, a task which a long-continued residence at Rome, with free access to the valuable stores of materials accumulated in the libraries there, has enabled him to execute in a satisfactory manner. The task was indeed one that required in no ordinary degree that minute and searching diligence for which the historical writers of Germany are so eminently distinguished. The materials were often scanty and imperfect, and the few meagre notices that have been transmitted to us are scattered through a number of different writers, or have to be gleaned from the barbarous charters and documents of the most obscure period of history. It is but justice to add that while M. Gregorovius has shown the most praiseworthy industry in accumulating his materials from all available sources, he has bestowed more pains than is common with his countrymen upon the form in which he has presented them to the reader, and has produced not only a work of value to the antiquarian student, but a readable and interesting book.

It is obviously impossible to draw any marked line of separation between the history of the Roman city in the more restricted sense in which alone M. Gregorovius has undertaken to write it, and that of the Papal power of which it was the centre. The revolutions of the Papacy were intimately connected with the fortunes of Rome itself; the rise of the temporal power of the Popes, their long contests with the Emperors of Germany, and still more their internal struggles with the Roman nobles and populace, are essential portions of the history of the city; and it is impossible to write a connected narrative of the latter that does not involve to a considerable extent the history of Latin Christianity. M. Gregorovius has, however, endeavoured, and in general with success, to steer between the two extremes, and while relating the history of the Popes, so far as this was immediately connected with, or directly influenced, the local history of Rome, to avoid digressing too widely into the general ecclesiastical or political history of Western Europe. In the following pages we shall confine ourselves almost exclusively to those portions of his work which relate more immediately to the local and (if we may venture to use the term) material history of Rome. The ecclesiastical and political revolutions of the city will already be



familiar to most of our readers from the works of Gibbon and Milman.

It is not very easy to determine the exact period when the ancient city may be considered as having reached the highest point of greatness and splendour. Even after the glorious works of Trajan and Hadrian, great additions were made to its architectural magnificence, and many of the most remarkable edifices belong to a time when the empire was already in a declining condition. Severus and his son Caracalla were among the emperors who contributed the most to the adornment of the city; the Septizonium continued throughout the middle ages to bear testimony to the magnificence of the former, as the gigantic ruins of his Thermæ still do to that of the latter. Again at a much later period, after the empire had been shaken by a long series of wars, of revolutions, and disorders of every kind, its political restoration under Diocletian and Constantine saw the imperial city once more enriched with important additions to its splendour. The Thermæ of Diocletian surpassed in vastness and extent, if they did not equal in magnificence, those of Caracalla; the Baths of Constantine were on a scale hardly inferior to them; while the Basilica dedicated by the same monarch, though in fact the work of his rival Maxentius, still attests the grandeur of its conception by the imposing character of its existing remains—the three gigantic arches or vaults which are familiar to all visitors to Rome under the misnomer of the Temple of Peace.

The removal of the seat of empire to Constantinople must have given a severe, as well as a permanent, shock to the material prosperity of Rome; but it would naturally be some time before its effects were apparent in the external aspect of the city, and there can be no doubt that the architectural magnificence of Rome was little, if at all, impaired when it was visited by the Emperor Constantius in A.D. 357. The contemporary historian, Ammianus Marcellinus, has left us a striking, though pompous, description of the effect produced on the imperial visitor by his first progress through the city—a description the more interesting, as it may naturally be supposed to reflect the impressions of Ammianus himself, a Greek native of Antioch, who had visited Rome for the first time much about the same period. With every allowance for rhetorical exaggeration, it is evident from this account that all the more important buildings of the city were still standing in all their original magnificence; and we may well sympathise with the sentiment attributed to the emperor, that, as he passed through the splendid series, each successive edifice appeared to him to surpass all others, until he

came to the Forum of Trajan: 'a work,' says the historian, 'without a parallel in the whole world, which surpasses all description, and will never again be rivalled by mortals.'\*

Less than fifty years after this time (A.D. 403), the Emperor Honorius made his solemn entrance into the city, which now for the last time witnessed the spectacle of an imperial triumph. Claudian has celebrated the event, as well as the victories of Stilicho which it was designed to commemorate, with the usual amount of courtly panegyric; and it is evident from the terms in which he extols the glories of the Capitol, the Imperial Palace, and the Forum, that these still retained all their ornamental decorations substantially unimpaired.† A great change had indeed come over the city in the interval since the visit of Constantius; the temples of the heathen gods had been finally closed and their worship interdicted by Theodosius, but these measures were too recent to have as yet produced any effect on the external appearance of the capital. The shrine of the Capitoline Jupiter was deserted, but the gilded roof of his temple still gleamed in all its brightness; the statues that crowded the Forum and the adjacent buildings were as yet untouched; and the adherents of the ancient religion might still delude themselves with the belief that the gods of Rome had not yet abandoned the city. But a few years later a fresh edict of Honorius himself (in 408), commanding the destruction of all images within the temples, may be considered as giving the death-blow to the pagan idolatry. Yet even this edict did not apply to any other than the idols consecrated in temples, while it was expressly prescribed that the buildings themselves should be preserved and placed under the charge of the imperial officers, in order to be applied to useful purposes.

There can be little doubt that the zeal of many of the new converts to Christianity would outstrip the injunctions of the imperial edict; the internal administration of the city was feeble and inefficient; and there is every reason to believe that a considerable amount of damage had been already done to the pagan temples and shrines before the capture of the city by the Goths. The triumphant terms in which St. Jerome and St. Augustine exult over the downfall of the heathen monuments are doubtless strongly tinged with exaggeration, but we cannot suppose them to be altogether without foundation. The partial demolition of ancient buildings had indeed begun long before. The edifices of Constantine himself were decorated with the spoils

---

\* Ammian. Marcellin. lib. xvi. cap. x. §§ 14, 15.

† Claudian de VI. Cons. Honorii, vv. 35-53.

of those of earlier emperors; and though a series of edicts under his sons and their successors prohibited such acts of spoliation, the very repetition of these decrees shows the continuance of the practice. It is probable, indeed, that it was as yet confined to the less conspicuous edifices and the remoter quarters of the city. It was here only that the signs of incipient decay could as yet be manifest; and it was only in such quarters that the Christian churches were beginning to raise their heads in rivalry with the ancient temples. All the celebrated basilicas and churches erected by Constantine and his immediate successors were situated either in the suburbs of Rome, without the walls, as St. Peter's, St. Paul's, St. Lorenzo, and Sta. Agnese, or, if within the limits of the city, still on its extreme verge, as the Basilica of the Lateran and Sta. Croce in Gerusalemme. Already, indeed, before the time of Honorius, they had crept on towards the interior of the city; but the pagan temples still held undisputed sway over the Forum and the Capitol; no Christian church had yet ventured to obtrude itself upon the Sacred Way: and as Honorius looked down from the palace of the Cæsars upon the ancient heart and centre of the life of Rome, there would have been little, if anything, to remind him that it was not still a pagan city.

A very few years only elapsed after the triumphant entry of Honorius, before the Romans beheld their city and themselves at the mercy of a foreign invader. The capture of Rome by Alaric, in 410, is chosen by M. Gregorovius as the immediate starting-point of his history; and the selection is undoubtedly a judicious one. As far as the history of the city is concerned, that event marks an era of far more consequence than the final extinction of the Western Empire. It was the first of that long series of calamities which was destined to bring down the imperial capital from its 'pride of place' to the lowest depths of desolation. It was the first startling proof to the world that the Eternal City was yet mortal, and revealed to succeeding swarms of invaders the secret at once of her weakness and her wealth. They were not slow in profiting by the lesson.

The actual amount of damage done to the buildings of Rome by the Goths under Alaric has been indeed the subject of much controversy, and the discussion has no doubt been coloured by partiality and prejudice. Lord Byron has enumerated in one pregnant line the chief of the destructive agents that have consummated the ruin of ancient Rome—

'The Goth, the Christian, Time, War, Flood, and Fire;'

but the respective proportions to be assigned to the two classes

first enumerated have been vehemently disputed. 'The exculpation of the Goths and Vandals' (says the commentator on the noble poet) 'has been thought prejudicial to the Christians, and the praise of the latter regarded as an injustice to the barbarians.' An able and dispassionate review of the whole question will be found in the work just cited; and we think that every unprejudiced reader will acquiesce in the conclusion that 'both the one and the other have been more active despoilers than has been confessed by their mutual apologists.'\*

M. Gregorovius has espoused the cause of the Goths, the Vandals, and other German races of barbarian invaders, with all the zeal of patriotism. But his conclusions with respect to the capture by Alaric do not differ materially from those of Gibbon, who says briefly: 'The edifices of Rome, though the damage has been much exaggerated, received some injury from the violence of the Goths.'† It is indeed certain that they could not have attempted any systematic destruction of the massive buildings and monuments during the very short period they remained in possession of the city—only three days, according to most of the contemporary writers, though one chronicler prolongs it to six. Even fire itself would have had little effect on the massive structures of stone and brass with which the city abounded; but it is certain that there was no extensive conflagration. The Goths, indeed, on first entering the city by the Salarian gate, set fire to the adjoining houses, and a portion of the neighbouring quarter was thus destroyed. The palace and gardens of Sallust, which had become a favourite imperial villa, perished on this occasion, and their blackened ruins were seen by the historian Procopius a hundred and forty years afterwards.‡ But there is nothing to lead us to suppose that any other public buildings of importance shared the same fate.

The indirect effect of the first capture of Rome was, however, far greater than its immediate results, in a material as well as a moral point of view. Had such an event been an isolated catastrophe, like the sack of Rome by the Constable of Bourbon in 1527, the damage would doubtless have been soon repaired. But Rome was at this period already in a state of constant, though as yet silent and unperceived, decay; and all the causes which contributed to the decline of its material prosperity were

---

\* Hobhouse's *Historical Illustrations of the Fourth Canto of Childe Harold*, p. 59.

† Gibbon, vol. iv. ch. xxxi. p. 105.

‡ Procop. de Bell. Vand. lib. i. c. ii.

from thenceforth left to act with accelerated force. The general dispersion of the Roman nobles, many of whom on this occasion quitted the city never to return, left their deserted palaces and villas to sink gradually into ruin. With them departed also the last influential supporters of the ancient religion; and it has been justly remarked by Dean Milman that the Gothic invasion gave the final blow to paganism. The funds destined for the repair and support of the heathen temples had been already withdrawn by Theodosius, and henceforward there was none to protect them. 'The deserted buildings had now neither public authority nor private zeal and munificence to maintain them against the encroachments of time or accident—to support the tottering roof, or repair the broken column.'\*

Some attempt was indeed made to repair the damages of the Goths; and the poet Rutilius, who visited the city seven years after the catastrophe, might delude himself with the poetic fancy that Rome was rising again after her misfortunes with even increased magnificence.† But the fatal blow was struck; the progress of decay was never again arrested; and, however little apparent might be the immediate effects of the Gothic invasion a few years afterwards, it is certain that Rome never recovered its plunder by Alaric.

There is no reason to suppose that the sack of the city by the Vandals under Genseric (A.D. 455) was more destructive than that of the Goths, so far as the mere edifices were concerned. We are indeed expressly told that the barbarian leader yielded to the representations of the Pope—Leo I., the same who had already averted the threatened invasion of Attila—so far as to promise to protect the buildings from fire, to spare the lives of the unresisting multitude, and to exempt the captives from torture; and though it is probable that these conditions would be imperfectly observed, we may reasonably believe that the barbarians in general inflicted no injury upon the public edifices, beyond such wanton mischief as would naturally arise in a period of indiscriminate licence and rapine. But the pillage of the city was far more complete than on the previous occasion: during the space of fourteen days the Vandals ransacked alike the temples of the gods, the Christian churches, the public buildings, and the private palaces, in search of booty,

---

\* Milman's *History of Christianity*, vol. iii. p. 181.

† 'Illud te reparat quod cætera regna resolvit:

Ordo renascendi est crescere posse malis.'

(*Rutil. Itinerar.* lib. i. v. 140.)

and whatever objects attracted their cupidity were carried off without distinction. A great portion of the vast wealth previously accumulated in the city, especially in the precious metals, had been carried away by the Goths, and could have been but partially replaced; yet the Vandals are said to have still found immense stores of gold and silver. All the treasures of the imperial palace fell into their hands; but, not content with this, they are said to have carried off the ornaments, and even the vessels, of bronze. The temple of the Capitoline Jove, which had been spared by the Goths, was plundered of all its statues, and half of its celebrated roof, which was covered with bronze thickly overlaid with gold, was stripped off and carried away to Carthage.\* The historian does not explain why *the whole* was not taken.

When we remember that, in addition to all this wealth, many thousand Romans of both sexes—many of them persons of the highest rank—were carried off into captivity, it is difficult to estimate too highly the effect produced by such a calamity upon the declining city. There can be no doubt that the population of Rome must have already greatly diminished: the occupation of the rich provinces of Africa by the Vandals had cut off one of its chief sources of supply and of revenue; the impoverished nobles were unable to repair their losses, or restore their crumbling palaces; and if the splendid monuments of her former greatness still towered proudly over the decaying city, it is certain that in many parts of Rome they already looked down upon deserted streets and ruined habitations.

Under such circumstances it was in vain that a fresh edict of Majorian—an emperor worthy of better times, whose name sheds a temporary lustre on the last miserable years of the Roman Empire—endeavoured with praiseworthy zeal to check the continually increasing practice of demolishing ancient edifices in order to apply their materials to the repair or the construction of recent ones. The evil was one that was inherent in the existing state of things; and whatever efforts to arrest its progress may have been made from time to time by an enlightened ruler like Majorian or Theodoric, it continued to operate, more or less openly, during a period of ten centuries. It is no doubt with justice that Gibbon ascribes to the slow and silent operation of this practice the gradual destruction of those massive structures which 'the Goths and Vandals had neither leisure nor 'power, nor perhaps inclination, to overthrow.'†

---

\* Procopius, *Bell. Vand.* i. c. v.

† Gibbon, *ch. xxxvi.* p. 269. ed. Smith.

The anarchy and confusion of the last few years of the Western Empire, in the course of which Rome was for the third time taken and plundered by Ricimer (A.D. 472), was followed by an interval of tranquillity and repose under the Gothic king Theodoric. During his long reign of thirty-three years Italy enjoyed absolute freedom from all foreign invasion, while the mild, and at the same time vigorous, administration of her barbarian ruler restored her in some measure to her former prosperity. Nor can it be doubted that Rome participated to a considerable extent in the general improvement. It was no mere flattery that dictated the phrase of 'Felix Roma,' which is found on inscriptions addressed to Theodoric. If, indeed, we may recur to the well-known expression of the satirist, and believe that the wants of the Roman people were still confined to the 'panem et circenses' of an earlier period, these were fully supplied under the Gothic king. The public distributions of bread, wine, and bacon among the populace of Rome were renewed with the return of plenty; and the games of the Circus were again exhibited amid the general enthusiasm of the multitude. Theodoric himself, like the later Roman emperors, took up his permanent residence at Ravenna, and only once visited the ancient capital; but his entry into Rome upon this occasion was celebrated with a pomp and magnificence that called forth from a pious African monk, who was present, the wondering exclamation, 'What must be the glories of the heavenly Jerusalem if they surpass those of the earthly Rome!' Such was the impression still made upon the stranger by the imperial city, even after the ravages of Alaric and Genseric.

Great care was bestowed by Theodoric and his enlightened minister, Cassiodorus, upon the maintenance and restoration of the public edifices in the city. An architect was specially appointed to superintend their repairs, and funds assigned him for the purpose; the prefect of the city was charged to watch with vigilance over the ancient monuments; while separate officers were appointed, the one to the care of the aqueducts, which still poured their abundant streams of water into the city, the other to protect from wanton injury and violence the numerous statues of bronze and marble that still adorned the streets and open places of Rome. It is evident, therefore, that neither the zeal of the Christians nor the cupidity of the Vandals had done more than diminish the numbers of that 'vast population' of statues \* which had long formed one of the

---

\* 'Populus copiosissimus statuarum.' (Cassiodor. *Var. lib.* vii. 13.)

most conspicuous and characteristic ornaments of the ancient city.

We must not, however, form to ourselves an exaggerated estimate of the actual condition of Rome under Theodoric. Thirty years of peace and good order may have done much for the material welfare of the population, but they undoubtedly did very little towards the restoration of the city. Even from the epistles of Cassiodorus himself, we may glean abundant evidence of its decayed and dilapidated condition. All the most conspicuous monuments were indeed still standing, if not uninjured, at least substantially entire; but of these, the imperial palace and the massive Theatre of Pompey—one of the most solid and imposing structures at Rome—were in need of considerable repairs. On the other hand, we hear incidentally of buildings falling into decay for want of inhabitants, of masses of stone and marble lying scattered about from neighbouring ruins; and even Theodoric himself took advantage of the ruined state of a palace on the Pincian hill to provide materials for his own palace at Ravenna. We have already seen that the mischief done to the Villa of Sallust by Alaric was never repaired. There is indeed no doubt that while the more conspicuous monuments in the centre of the city would be the first objects of the care of the imperial officers, many buildings in the outskirts must have been left to the natural progress of decay, or to the depredations of unscrupulous neighbours.

But even if the reign of Theodoric had produced far more beneficial effects upon the city of Rome than we can safely ascribe to it, all such improvement was much more than compensated by the destructive period that followed. It is to the wars of the Gothic kings with Belisarius and Narses that we must attribute the final ruin of Rome. During a period of seventeen years (536–553), almost all the evils which it is possible for war to inflict were accumulated on the devoted city. Twice did she hold out against the Gothic armies with despairing energy, until her inhabitants had suffered the last extremities of famine, and thousands had perished of hunger; twice did she see her almost deserted streets occupied by the victorious barbarians, and all her remaining wealth at the mercy of their ravages. On the first of these occasions, indeed, we are told by the contemporary historian that Totila had actually determined to level the city to the ground, and ‘convert Rome into ‘a sheepwalk;’ but the more generous feelings of the barbarian hero were awakened by the remonstrances of Belisarius: he abandoned the project, and contented himself with destroying



a considerable portion of the external walls.\* Partial conflagrations, however, had already laid waste several quarters of the city; and so complete was its desolation that (if we can believe the express statement of Procopius, who himself visited Rome in the following year) when Totila entered the city, he found but *five hundred* inhabitants remaining, all the rest having either perished by famine or made their escape by flight. Of this miserable remnant, some were put to the sword, others led away into captivity, while the rest were driven out into the neighbouring country; so that we are assured that when Totila finally quitted Rome in the spring of 547, he left not a living soul within its walls!† However much we may suspect this statement of exaggeration, the very fact that such a report should have been current shortly after the event is sufficient proof to what an extremity of misery the Romans had been reduced.

When Belisarius recovered possession of Rome, he hastened to restore its fortifications, by rebuilding the portion of the walls that had been destroyed by Totila; and some parts of the still existing circuit bear evidence of their hasty reconstruction at this period. But we have no account of his attempting the restoration of the city itself, which he had doubtless neither time nor means to undertake. Totila himself is said to have endeavoured, after his second capture of Rome, to repair in some measure the evils inflicted during his former siege, and to have collected together the fugitive and scattered population of the city once more within its walls. But it was impossible for him to do much within the few months that he remained master of Rome; and the games that he exhibited for the last time in the Circus Maximus must have presented a melancholy contrast to the multitudes that once crowded its benches. A striking evidence of the depopulated state of the city at this time is found in the fact, incidentally mentioned by Procopius, that when the Greek general Diogenes was preparing for the second time to defend Rome against Totila, he provided for the subsistence of his troops by sowing with corn the extensive vacant spaces *within* the walls.‡

But of all the permanent injuries inflicted upon the city

\* Procop. Bell. Goth. iii. 22.

† *Ibid.* iii. 20. 22. A contemporary chronicler adds, quaintly enough, that for forty days or more Rome was so entirely desolate, that not a human being was to be found there, *except beasts*. (Marcellin. Chronicon.)

‡ *Ibid.* lib. iii. cap. xxxvi.

by the Gothic wars, the most serious and irreparable was the destruction of the aqueducts, which were broken down by Vitiges during the first siege, and never again restored. A comparatively small supply of water would indeed have sufficed for the diminished population of Rome during the middle ages; and it appears that three out of the fourteen aqueducts were at some later period partially repaired, and continued to furnish a scanty supply even as late as the ninth and tenth centuries. But the noble arches that still stretch in long lines across the Campagna have been continually mouldering into ruin ever since they were first broken by the Gothic king.

The last capture of Rome by Totila may be considered as terminating the series of the barbarian invasions. From that time for nearly three centuries and a half her walls were not entered by a foreign enemy; for although the Lombards repeatedly ravaged the surrounding country, their attacks on the city itself were always unsuccessful. But from the brief view which we have been able to give of the actual results of the barbarian ravages, it will sufficiently appear how enormous was the injury really inflicted. The Goths and Vandals undoubtedly did not, as asserted by the earlier Italian historians, and believed by popular tradition, deliberately destroy the public buildings and monuments of the city, or involve them in one common conflagration; but the calamities entailed upon the unhappy city by their means were such as to reduce it from a gorgeous and opulent capital to a scene of ruin and desolation, in the midst of which the magnificent monuments of former greatness were become altogether things of the past, which the scanty and decaying population had neither the spirit nor the means to repair.

The half-century which followed the recovery of Rome by Narses was a period of manifold suffering and misery; and the accession of Gregory the Great in 590 may perhaps be taken as the point at which the unhappy city had sunk to the lowest state of degradation. An old prophecy, ascribed to Benedict of Nursia, at the time when Totila was thundering at the gates of Rome, had foretold that the city would not be destroyed by the barbarians, but would crumble away by gradual decay and the destructive influence of natural causes, of tempests and lightning, of whirlwinds and earthquakes; and when the first of the Gregories ascended the pontifical throne, he himself believed that the prophecy was on the point of fulfilment. While the feeble rule of the exarchs of Ravenna and the supine negligence of the Byzantine emperors opposed scarcely any barrier to the ravages of the Lombards, it seemed as if all

the natural causes of destruction were combining their efforts against the devoted city. An extraordinary inundation of the Tiber, during which the waters rose to an unprecedented height, is expressly said to have caused the ruin of many ancient buildings; and this was immediately followed by a pestilence, which threatened to sweep off the whole of the scanty population that had again gathered within the walls. St. Gregory has himself left us a fearful picture of the ravages caused by this plague, during which the excited imagination of the Romans fancied they saw the arrows of destruction shot down from heaven, as they had before seen gigantic dragons floating down the stream of the Tiber during the recent floods.

To the same state of feeling we are indebted for one of the most striking and picturesque of the mediæval legends of Rome. It was while the plague of 590 was still raging that Gregory, then just elected Pope, ordered a general procession of all the clergy and inhabitants of the city. Three days long did the whole population of Rome, in the garb and attitude of penitents and suppliants—the numerous clergy and still more numerous monks and nuns at their head—defile in solemn procession through the silent and half-deserted streets; and such was the unabated virulence of the plague that eighty persons (we are told) dropped down dead as they were thus moving along. But as the head of the long train was crossing the Ælian Bridge, on its way to St. Peter's, the figure of the Archangel Michael was seen to hover in the air over the monument of Hadrian, brandishing in his hand a flaming sword, which he returned to its sheath as the procession drew near—a sign that the Divine wrath was appeased and the pestilence was at an end. The memory of this celebrated vision was preserved by the erection of a small church dedicated to the Archangel on the summit of the mausoleum itself, which has ever since borne the name of the Castle of St. Angelo.

The age of Belisarius and Narses may be considered as closing the history of Imperial Rome; with that of Gregory the Great begins the history of the Papal city. To the energy and ability of that remarkable man may undoubtedly be ascribed the foundation of the Papal power, and indeed of the Papacy itself, in the modern sense of the term. To him also was Rome indebted for all its subsequent greatness. Seizing with a firm and vigorous grasp the reins of government, which had been allowed to drop from the listless hands of the exarchs of Ravenna, he raised up on the banks of the Tiber the standard of a power around which other nations might cluster; and Rome

was once more elevated from a provincial city of the Byzantine Empire to be the capital of the Western world. Yet there is hardly any memorable name throughout the long series of the Roman pontiffs which is associated with so few material monuments of his greatness: Gregory devoted all his energies to the political and ecclesiastical interests of the pontificate, and the times were such as to leave him little leisure for other occupations. He was content to leave it to succeeding Popes to adorn the city with churches and mosaics worthy of the capital of Christianity; it was enough for him to have raised it to that proud position.

It is scarcely necessary to say that there is no foundation for the popular tradition which ascribed to Gregory the Great the deliberate destruction of the ancient monuments, any more than for the similar story of his having wilfully burned the still extant remains of ancient literature. But there is no doubt that his austere and monastic spirit would regard both the one and the other with indifference, if not contempt; and the purely ecclesiastical character henceforth imparted to the government of Rome could not fail to prove detrimental to the remains of antiquity. Nowhere was this tendency more strongly shown than in the increased number and importance of the churches with which Rome was adorned during the seventh and the two following centuries. Honorius I., who ascended the Papal throne less than twenty years after the death of Gregory, was one of the most active of the pontiffs in this respect. During a reign of thirteen years, besides large additions to the decoration of the Basilica of St. Peter's, he rebuilt or restored the ancient church of Sta. Agnese without the walls, that of the Quattro Santi Coronati, and of Sta. Lucia in Selce; and erected for the first time that of St. Adriano, remarkable as being the first Christian church of any importance that occupied a position immediately on the Roman Forum.

Whether from some remnant of respect for ancient memories, or simply from the solidity and perfection of their original construction, it is certain that the pagan edifices which clustered around the Forum were long spared from destruction; and it was only by slow degrees that the Christian churches established themselves in its immediate precincts. Honorius himself deserves the reproach of being the first to strip the gilded roof from the splendid temple of Venus and Rome, in order to adorn the Basilica of St. Peter's—an act of spoliation for which he with difficulty extorted the necessary permission from the Emperor Heraclius. The Byzantine emperors, indeed, still claimed a shadow of authority at Rome, and appear to have

been still recognised as the guardians of the public buildings. Hence we find them, in 609, granting a similar permission to Pope Boniface IV., for the more laudable purpose of consecrating the Pantheon of Agrippa as a Christian church—a measure to which we are indebted for the matchless preservation of that noble monument.

But the cases of such direct transformations were few. Far more frequently it happened that a Christian church arose on the site of some half-ruined temple, and was built in great part out of the materials of the pagan edifice. Not less than fifty-six churches in the modern city are supposed to have thus succeeded to ancient temples on the same sites, and though this number is probably exaggerated, there can be no doubt of the frequency of the practice. In all such cases it was sought, as far as possible, to conciliate the pagan feelings, which still lingered among the lower orders of the populace, by adapting the choice of the saints to whom the new churches were consecrated to the old traditions connected with the sites. Thus the twin-brothers St. Cosmas and St. Damianus succeeded to the twin-heroes Romulus and Remus. The two warlike saints, St. Sebastian and St. George, took the place of Mars himself; and the Temple of Romulus at the foot of the Palatine hill was dedicated to St. Theodore, a foundling and a warrior like the Roman king, who has succeeded also to the reputation enjoyed by his royal predecessor as a healer of sickly infants, which are now brought by Roman nurses and mothers to the shrine of the Christian saint, as they were in the days of Augustus to that of the warrior-king.

It is obvious that the stimulus thus imparted to the building of churches must have operated, in the great majority of cases, to the injury, if not the destruction, of the ancient monuments. Not a church was erected at Rome during the whole course of the middle ages that was not adorned with columns of granite or precious marbles, or paved with porphyry and serpentine; and as these costly materials had long ceased to be imported into Rome, it may safely be assumed that, in every such instance, they were derived from some ancient building. Many of them, indeed, may have been supplied by the ruins of the numerous private palaces that had covered the Seven Hills with their stately courts and porticoes; but it is certain that the public edifices and temples were not spared, as indeed it was little likely that they should be. In many cases these had already passed into the hands of private persons, whose piety would often deem that they could not be better employed than in the adornment of the sacred edifices. The wholesale manner

in which this conversion of ancient materials to the construction of ecclesiastical buildings was carried on, is nowhere better seen than in the celebrated Basilica of St. Lorenzo without the walls of Rome, the more ancient portion of which, erected by Pope Pelagius II. towards the end of the sixth century, is put together wholly of ancient fragments—friezes, columns, capitals, and cornices, of the most heterogeneous character, but all alike bearing evidence of their being derived from previously existing buildings of a far purer style of architecture.

Nor was the destruction confined to these ornamental materials, though it is here only that we can trace it. The massive blocks of hewn stone would no doubt be used up as they were required; and even lime for cement was not to be obtained, either in Rome itself or its immediate neighbourhood, except by the consumption of ancient materials. Probably, of all the causes of destruction, this was one of the most active. Even in the fifteenth century, Poggio Bracciolini tells us that he had himself seen the marble columns of the Temple of Concord converted into lime; and we find repeated mention during the darker ages of the establishment of 'lime-works' by successive pontiffs, either for the supply of their own constructions, or for the repair of the walls of the city. All such 'calcaria' were undoubtedly supplied in great part with the spoils of ancient edifices and the fragments of mutilated statues. When the buildings were thus stripped of their marble casings, and the columns which had adorned or supported them, there would still remain the nucleus of stone or brickwork, which would be too solid to be destroyed without deliberate violence. Even this was not wanting. In one instance, we are expressly told that Pope Hadrian I., in order to enlarge the church of Sta. Maria in Cosmedin, destroyed 'by fire and the united labours of a vast multitude of people for the space of a whole year a massive structure (maximum monumentum) of travertine.' But such laborious Vandalism must have been rare; and there is little doubt that during the seventh and eighth centuries the whole city presented the aspect of a vast wilderness of ruins, interspersed as at the present day with gardens and orchards, in the midst of which the churches and convents alone bore witness to the first rising dawn of a new civilisation.

In a few instances only have the meagre biographies of the Popes, which are almost our only authorities for the greater part of this period, preserved to us any record of particular acts of spoliation. The plunder of the golden roof of the Temple of Venus and Rome by Pope Honorius I. has been

already mentioned; a more extensive devastation of the same kind is recorded of the Greek Emperor, Constans II., the last of the Byzantine emperors who set foot within the walls of Rome, and who signalised his visit to the capital of the Western world (in 663) by the display of a rapacity worthy of Genseric himself. Even after the ravages of the Vandal king and the long period of suffering that had followed, it appears that the city still retained many statues and other ornamental works of bronze, the whole of which were carried away by the Greek Emperor, who even stripped the Pantheon, notwithstanding its recent consecration as a church, of the bronze plates that formed its roof. Yet neither he nor the Vandal king had the courage to remove the beams of gilt bronze that supported the roof of the portico, which were reserved for the rapacity of an Italian Pope in the seventeenth century!\*

The visit of Constans to Rome involuntarily recalls that of his predecessor Constantius, so different in its circumstances and results; and it would be interesting to compare the state of the city as it presented itself to the eyes of the one and of the other, but the materials are unfortunately wanting. Constans had no Ammianus to describe his entry. But about a century and a half later, a visitant of a far humbler class has left us a record which serves to throw a ray of light upon the darkness that so long shrouds the remains of the Eternal City.

During the seventh and eighth centuries Rome had become the resort of innumerable pilgrims, who flocked from all parts of Western Europe to see the Holy City, and to worship at the tombs and shrines of her saints and martyrs. None were more prominent in this pious duty than our Anglo-Saxon forefathers, so recently converted to Christianity; and there even came to be a street or quarter in the immediate neighbourhood of St. Peter's, known as the '*Vicus Saxonum*,' and inhabited exclusively by Anglo-Saxon pilgrims and settlers. The worship of relics, which had already commenced at a much earlier period, had attained, under the auspices of Gregory the Great and his immediate successors, to its highest developement. The possession of them became a fertile source of wealth to the churches and convents of Rome, while they were eagerly coveted by the more wealthy and powerful devotees. Happy were those who could carry away with them from the Holy City the smallest fragment of these sacred objects; and any means were thought justifiable for the attainment of so holy an end. While the

---

\* It was this act of Vandalism by Urban VIII. (Barbarini) that gave occasion to the well-known, and well-deserved, pasquinade,

'*Quod non fecere barbari, fecere Barbarini.*'

Lombard king Astolphus was besieging Rome and laying waste the Campagna with fire and sword, his fierce soldiers were employed in the intervals of their ravages in ransacking the cemeteries without the walls, and plundering the catacombs of the bodies of supposed saints and martyrs, which were conveyed with the utmost care and reverence to the cities of Lombardy, to become the pride and treasure of their numerous churches. Even the enlightened Eginhart, the secretary of Charlemagne, boasts of the skilful manner in which his agents had contrived to steal the bodies of two saints—St. Marcellinus and St. Peter, not the apostle—from the vault where they were deposited at Rome, and transport them to Aix-la-Chapelle.

Among the numerous pilgrims thus attracted to Rome there must have been some who were not insensible to the more ancient associations of the place, and even the most ignorant of devotees could not fail to be struck with the grandeur of the still existing monuments. The effect produced upon the minds of the Anglo-Saxon pilgrims by the most imposing of them all—the colossal amphitheatre which still rose in unimpaired grandeur and perfection in the midst of the ruined city—is recorded in the well-known saying, preserved to us by the Venerable Bede: ‘While stands the Coliseum, Rome shall stand; when falls the Coliseum, Rome shall fall; and when ‘Rome falls, the world.’ Doubtless there was no want of *ciceroni*, who would guide the pilgrims from church to church and from shrine to shrine, and would point out to them, in passing, the temples and mouldering ruins, already designated by many a strange misnomer, and the spots with which were associated traditions still more strangely perverted. In one instance, at least, there was found a pilgrim, from the remote convent of Einsiedeln in Switzerland, who had the curiosity to note down in their order the more remarkable of the buildings which he saw, as well as the inscriptions still legible on the ancient monuments, many of which have long since disappeared. A fortunate accident has preserved to us this earliest ‘Handbook of Rome,’ and has thus enabled us to form some idea of the aspect of the city as it presented itself to the eyes of a pilgrim in the days of Charlemagne.

The Roman Forum is even at the present day by far the most striking spot in the imperial city, not merely for its associations with the past, but from the numerous ruins which are still grouped around it, and which, broken and mutilated as they are, impress the mind of the visitor with the idea of ancient magnificence even more strongly than the most perfect of the isolated edifices. But far more powerful must have been this impression at the period which we are now consider-



ing. The ancient temples were then most of them still standing; and though they must probably have been already in a state of decay, and some at least partially in ruins, we know that the splendid Temple of Venus and Rome, so recently stripped of its gorgeous roof, must have been otherwise nearly entire; the three temples of Concord, of Vespasian, and of Saturn, at the foot of the Capitoline hill, were also nearly perfect, so that the pilgrim was able to read the entire inscriptions on their architraves; the extensive ruins of the Basilica Julia were known as 'the Palace of Catiline;' while near the Arch of Septimius Severus stood a sanctuary connected by Roman tradition with the very earliest ages of the city—the little Temple of Janus, the 'index of peace and war.' This celebrated temple is described to us by Procopius in the sixth century (precisely as we see it represented on coins of the Emperor Nero) as a small shrine or chapel of bronze, with room only for the statue of the deity, and with two doors—those famous doors, which were closed only when Rome was at peace with all the world. The preservation of such a relic down to the days of our anonymous guide, and even to a later period of the middle ages\*, shows how little, in comparison with other parts of the city, the Forum had yet suffered. Nor was the original character of the place yet destroyed by the accumulation of *débris* and rubbish. The open space or *emplacement* of the Forum itself still retained its original level, and though partially encumbered by the huge unsightly base of the barbarous column of Phocas—that last degrading monument of Roman servility—was still occasionally used as a place of assembly for public purposes. As late as the year 768 we find the assembled clergy and people of Rome proceeding to the election of a Pope, Stephen III., on the very spot where the patricians of ancient Rome had met for the election of their kings and consuls.

By a strange accident, while the Forum had retained so much of its ancient aspect and character, its *name* was totally lost in popular usage; and the locality was commonly known as the 'Tria Fata,' from three bronze statues supposed by popular superstition to represent the three Fates, but which there is good reason to identify with the statues of the three Sibyls, mentioned by Pliny as among the most ancient works of their class extant in his day †, and believed to have been dedicated by the elder

---

\* It is mentioned under the name of 'Templum Fatale' in the twelfth century, when it appears to have been still standing.

† Plin. Hist. Nat. xxxiv. 5. § 22.

Tarquin. The statues themselves, which were still standing in the days of Procopius, had apparently disappeared in the ninth century; but the name still clung to the locality, and the popular assemblies are described by contemporary chroniclers as being held 'in tribus Fatis.'

The Sacred Way, with its ancient pavement, was still uncovered, and the solemn ecclesiastical processions of the ninth and tenth centuries, as they defiled along its hallowed course, still descended from the 'Arch of the Seven Candlesticks,' as the Arch of Titus was commonly called, to the open space of the Forum beneath, by the same steep slope down which the triumphant Roman generals had led the captive Britons and Germans. On their left hand the palace of the Cæsars must have presented a very different aspect from that wilderness of ruins which now covers the Palatine hill. A part of it was still habitable, and was occasionally occupied by the exarchs of Ravenna and 'dukes' of Rome as late as the beginning of the eighth century; but from this time we find no similar notices, and it is probable (as M. Gregorovius observes) that it was already given up to the owls and bats in the days of Charlemagne, who, during his repeated visits to Rome, took up his residence in the neighbourhood of St. Peter's. But the greater part of the vast complex of structures which had occupied the whole Palatine hill must have been long before in a ruinous condition. The Septizonium of Severus, which stood at the south-western corner of the hill, was indeed still perfect, and from its massive construction had at an early period been occupied as a fortress; but this was evidently wholly detached from the 'Palatium' itself, and parts of the intervening space were probably already occupied, as at the present day, by gardens and orchards. Only two small churches had as yet arisen on the site; and from the time that the palace was finally deserted the Imperial Mount itself appears to have been uninhabited. The Aventine, on the contrary, now one of the most desolate quarters of Rome, was in the ninth and tenth centuries well peopled; and, what appears to us more strange, its air was reckoned particularly healthy. The Circus Maximus was still comparatively perfect, and retained at least its general form. Two triumphal arches still adorned its two extremities, but the obelisks were already fallen.

It is a singular fact that we are almost wholly in the dark as to the condition of the Capitol at this period. From the days of Cassiodorus, when the glories of the 'lofty Capitol' are spoken of as something surpassing the conception of man, for a space of more than five centuries its name is never mentioned

in history; and our anonymous guide contents himself with a bare mention of the 'Capitolium' that throws no light upon its condition. We know, indeed, that there had arisen on the eastern summit of the hill a convent called Sta. Maria in Capitolio, the first mention of which is found in the year 880, though it was probably more ancient; but the date of its original construction, as well as that of the adjoining church (now called Sta. Maria in Araceli), is unknown. In the eleventh century, on the contrary, the Capitol assumes once more an important part in the history of the city. Its strong and isolated position rendered it a post of importance in the civil contests by which the Romans were then distracted, and it was for some time occupied by the powerful family of the Corsi, who fortified it with towers; but it was wrested from their hands, and their fortresses destroyed, by the Emperor Henry IV., in 1084. It is more remarkable that it became at this period the scene of numerous popular assemblies; and the open space between the two summits—the present Piazza del Campidoglio.—which in ordinary times served as a market-place, was now the spot usually selected by the leaders of the nobles, or the populace, of whichever faction was for the moment triumphant, to assemble their adherents and promulgate decrees in the name of the Roman people. Hence it is not uncommon to find public documents of this period conclude with the formula, 'actum civitate Romana apud Capitolium.' But the hill could have been very partially inhabited.\* A bull of the anti-pope Anaclete II. (between 1130 and 1134), by which he grants to the monastery of Sta. Maria 'the whole hill of the Capitol, with its cottages, crypts, cellars, gardens, fruit-trees, . . . walls, stones, and columns,' shows that it was at this time already approaching the aspect that it had assumed in the days of Poggio Bracciolini, when he tells us that the 'aurea Capitolia' were once more become, as they had been in the days of Evander, 'silvestribus horrida dumis.'

Of the imperial Fora we learn nothing; how and at what period this splendid series of monuments disappeared, we know not. The only one of which we find any notice after the fall of the Western Empire is the Forum of Trajan—the most magnificent of them all—which appears to have retained at least some portion of its splendour in the days of Gregory the Great; but from that time we hear no more of it, except the passing mention of its name by our anonymous guide, till the twelfth century, when it was altogether in ruins. A church of St. Nicholas, 'ad columnam Trajanam,' had been built on the site, and doubtless out of the ancient materials; and the mention

of houses and *gardens* among its appurtenances shows that the surrounding space must have been in a state of complete neglect, and was doubtless already to a considerable extent filled up with soil. The column alone owed its preservation to the church thus attached to it, under the safeguard of which it was placed; that of Marcus Aurelius was in like manner protected by a small chapel at its foot dedicated to St. Andrew; and the monks of the neighbouring convent of St. Silvester derived an addition to their revenues from the offerings of the pilgrims that visited and ascended the column.

Very different must have been the scene which met their eyes, as they looked from thence towards St. Peter's and the Castle of St. Angelo, from that which is now presented by the Campus Martius. The broad plain that extends from the Pincian hill to the Tiber, now occupied by the churches and palaces of the modern city, and crowded with a numerous population, then offered to the view 'the imposing aspect of a mighty city lying in ruins.' The gigantic remains of the Thermæ of Agrippa and of Alexander Severus, the Stadium of Domitian, the Odeum, the Circus Agonalis (now converted into the Piazza Navona), the Theatre of Pompey and that of Marcellus, the Portico of Octavia, and numerous other edifices, formed a series unsurpassed in grandeur; and though most if not all of these imposing structures were by this time in a state of ruin and decay, there was still enough left in their 'disjecta membra' to enable even the feeblest imagination to rise to a conception of their original magnificence. The Pantheon alone still rose in the midst of these multifarious ruins in almost unimpaired perfection, 'simple, erect, severe;' its simplicity and severity not yet interfered with by the belfries with which it was disfigured by Urban VIII. The Mausoleum of Hadrian, on the other side of the Tiber, still retained its casing of white marble, and even its doors and other ornaments of bronze; but its statues had long since disappeared, and the little chapel of St. Michael, on the summit, gave a mediæval aspect to the whole building.

When we compare the state of the Campus Martius at this period with that of the older quarters of Rome, we cannot fail to perceive that the reconstruction of the modern city has been far more destructive than the desolation of the old. In the one case almost all the monuments enumerated by the pilgrim of the ninth century have made way for modern structures, and their very foundations have been buried under the houses and palaces of the new city; in the other it is remarkable how large a portion of the edifices existing at the earlier period have survived to the present day, or left ruins sufficient to identify

their original position. So many of these monuments (observes Sir J. Hobhouse) have been partially preserved to this day, that one is led to suspect that those of a slighter construction had already yielded to violence or time, and those only had remained which were to continue the wonder of a thousand years. We must remember, however, that our guide would naturally enumerate only the more conspicuous and striking of the monuments: the Seven Hills were doubtless crowded with obscure and nameless ruins, which would have afforded inexhaustible subjects of interest and controversy to modern antiquarians, but were passed by without a thought by the pilgrim of the middle ages.

The same destructive agencies continued in operation after the period which we have been now considering, some of them at least with increased intensity. The shadowy restoration of the Western Empire under Charlemagne brought with it no restoring influences for the imperial city. On the other hand, the great accession to the wealth and power of the Papacy, resulting from the donations of Pepin, of Charlemagne, and of his son Louis, while it undoubtedly contributed to the wealth and importance of the Papal capital, could have no other than an injurious effect upon the preservation of the still surviving relics of ancient Rome. The building of new churches was carried on with increased activity (there are no names in the long list of pontiffs more prominent in this respect than those of Hadrian I. and Leo III., the two contemporaries of Charlemagne), and the increasing splendour of the decorations and architecture of the new ecclesiastical structures had still to be supplied from the same inexhaustible quarry—the remains of the pagan city. The numerous monasteries, too, which had arisen in every quarter of Rome, must have contributed to the same end. More than forty of these are known to us by name from their incidental mention in writers of the time; and the catalogue is doubtless far from complete. It was thus that the external aspect of Rome was gradually assuming a predominant ecclesiastical character; the ruins, as well as the traditions, of the ancient city giving way more and more to the rising spirit of the Papacy.

But if the temporal power of the Popes had undoubtedly a tendency to promote the material prosperity of the city, it is not the less certain that it brought with it a long train of attendant evils. From the moment that the Papal tiara became the symbol of temporal sovereignty, it became also the object of worldly ambition. The most wealthy and powerful families of Rome disputed with one another the possession of a prize

which conferred not only a vague and ill-defined ecclesiastical supremacy, but the possession of broad lands and castles, as well as the title, at least, to the dominion of extensive provinces. The election to the Papal throne still rested with the Roman people—that is to say, with the assembled clergy, nobles, and people of Rome. The German Emperors of the West claimed, indeed, to have a right of confirmation, and often attempted to set aside an election that had been made without their concurrence or that of their deputy; but this right, like most others in these troubled times, depended, in fact, upon the power of those who claimed to exercise it: it was upheld and admitted when asserted by a Charlemagne or an Otho, but it fell into disuse or was trampled under foot in the case of their feeble successors. Throughout the ninth and tenth centuries—until just before the close of the latter—the Popes were exclusively of Roman origin. Not less than forty-four pontiffs occupied the chair of St. Peter within the space of two hundred years, without reckoning those who are rejected by ecclesiastical historians as irregularly elected; and it may be said with little exaggeration that through this whole period there was scarcely an election that was not marked by scenes of tumult and violence.

Assuredly no other history in the world presents so long and continuous a series of revolutions and disorders as that of the Papal State, from the moment of its constitution as a temporal power to the present day. And yet the Papal power has risen triumphant from them all. Through ages of anarchy and confusion, battling by turns with popular revolutions in the city, with the fierce and sanguinary barons of the Campagna, with the powerful and unscrupulous Emperors of Germany; often sunk apparently to the last extremity of weakness; degraded at times to the very last dregs of degradation; polluted by every crime that can sully a throne,—the temporal sovereignty of the Popes has survived all its dangers, and baffled all its enemies.

While Rome was thus distracted by civil commotions, and torn to pieces by factions within her walls, she saw her territories and all the surrounding provinces exposed to the depredations of an enemy far more assiduous and unsparing than the Goths or the Lombards. It is to the ravages of the Saracens in the eighth and ninth centuries that we must mainly ascribe the desolation of the Campagna and the provinces north of the Tiber, now known as the Patrimony of St. Peter. Their piratical squadrons had already begun to infest the coasts of Italy before the death of Charlemagne, and gave occasion to the first erection of those watch-towers which have ever since formed so prominent and picturesque a characteristic

of the maritime scenery of Italy. But it was not till after their conquest of Sicily in 831 that their expeditions assumed a more formidable character. The port of Centumcellæ, now *Cività Vecchia*\*, fell into their hands; and Ostia was hastily fortified by Gregory IV. in order to prevent its sharing the same fate. The precaution was however useless, so far as the protection of Rome itself was concerned. In 846 a numerous Saracen fleet entered the mouths of the Tiber, and a force landing from the ships advanced almost without opposition to the very gates of Rome. The walls of the city, indeed, might defy the efforts of invaders who came without any preparations for a regular siege; but their object was plunder, and not conquest, and without the walls, unprotected as yet by any fortifications, lay the two great sanctuaries of the Roman world, the basilicas of St. Peter and St. Paul, rich with the accumulated offerings of five centuries, which had been spared by the Goths, the Vandals, and the Lombards, but now fell a prey to a predatory band of Mussulmans. A few days sufficed to carry off all the treasures that had been presented to these hallowed shrines by emperors and popes, by prelates and nobles, from the days of Constantine to those of Charlemagne, which were hastily deposited in the ships of the Saracens and carried off to Africa. The Markgrave Guido of Spoleto, summoned in all haste by the Pope to his assistance, arrived in time to pursue the invaders to their ships, but too late to recover any portion of their booty.

Great indeed must have been the consternation of the Romans at such a catastrophe. The mischief done was irremediable, but it was necessary to guard against its repetition; and with this view Pope Leo IV. — a pontiff of more than common energy and ability — hastened to enclose the sacred precincts of St. Peter's within the fortifications of the city. Around the great basilica itself there had clustered many smaller churches and convents, and an extensive suburb had gradually grown up, peopled for the most part by foreigners — Saxons, Lombards, Frisians, Franks and others — who had come to Rome as pilgrims, and established themselves permanently in the neighbourhood of the holy places. The whole of this new quarter — hitherto known only as 'the suburb,' 'il Borgo,' a term familiar

---

\* The inhabitants retired to the interior, and lived scattered over the country for forty years, till they were gathered together by Leo IV., who settled them in a new city to which he gave the name of *Leopolis*. But the new colony did not prosper, and before long the inhabitants determined to return to their original home, which has been called 'the old city' (*Cività Vecchia*) ever since.

to all lovers of art from the title of Raffaele's celebrated fresco — was now surrounded with a wall by Leo, and the pious work, assisted by contributions from all parts of Italy, was carried on with such activity that the new fortifications were completed within four years (848–852). It was the first permanent addition made to the city since the walls of Rome were first erected by Aurelian; and the new quarter deservedly bore the name of its founder, and continued to be known throughout the middle ages as 'the Leonine City' (*Civitas Leonina*).

The immediate object of the addition thus made to the fortifications of Rome was, doubtless, no other than the protection of the tomb of St. Peter and the surrounding churches and monasteries; but the new quarter soon assumed a prominent place in the history of the city for other reasons. The Leonine City continued to be separated from the adjoining parts of Rome by the old walls, which were not destroyed. The Castle of St. Angelo, which had already been converted into a strong fortress, with flanking walls down to the river, commanded the approach to the bridge, and could cut off all communication between the new suburb and the portions of the city on the other side of the Tiber. Hence the Pope, if established at St. Peter's, could maintain the new city as a separate fortress; on the other hand, the Roman people could shut against him the gates of their own city, and confine him to the isolated quarter in which he found himself; and whenever a hostile faction succeeded in making itself master of the fortress of St. Angelo, it rendered it impossible for the Pope to proceed from one of the great basilicas to the other, or from the palace of the Lateran to that of the Vatican.

Among the numerous unsatisfactory suggestions that have been proposed, at the present day, for the solution of that difficult problem—the establishment of the Pope at Rome in an independent ecclesiastical position, when shorn of his temporal sovereignty — a favourite idea has been that of confining him to the Leonine City, leaving him uncontrolled jurisdiction over this quarter, similar to that of an abbot over the precincts of his abbey, but with no other power in the rest of Rome than the ecclesiastical supremacy he would enjoy over the rest of the Catholic world. That which has been proposed in modern times as a pacific solution of a difficulty, was repeatedly brought about in the middle ages by the contests of rival factions. More than once did the Pope maintain himself in the possession of the Leonine City, when all the other quarters of Rome were held against him by hostile nobles or the insurgent populace; sometimes, on the other hand, the Leonine City itself



fell into the hands of his enemies, who debarred him from all access to the tomb of St. Peter. Hadrian IV. went so far as to lay all the rest of Rome under an interdict, while he himself was confined within the walls of the Papal quarter—a spectacle we might possibly see renewed in our own day, if the ingenious expedient just suggested were carried into effect.

The efforts of Leo IV. were not confined to the fortification of the city. He concluded a league with the maritime republics of Naples, Amalfi, and Gaëta, which were just beginning to rise into importance, and with their assistance obtained a decisive victory over the Saracen fleet in the neighbourhood of Ostia—a success which M. Gregorovius does not hesitate to compare to the battle of Lepanto, but which owes its chief celebrity at the present day to its having been made the subject of one of Raffaele's famous frescoes in the Stanze of the Vatican. But neither this victory, nor that obtained by Pope John VIII. *in person* over the Saracen fleet off Cape Circeo, was able to check the depredations of these formidable pirates. The maritime republics found it safer and more profitable to conclude treaties with the infidels; they afforded shelter to their fleets, and even united their forces with them as allies. But the dangers from the Saracens were not confined to the sea. Their progress by land was even more alarming. After making themselves masters of some of the fairest provinces in the south of Italy, they established themselves permanently on the banks of the Garigliano, and laid waste, with fire and sword, the whole of the Roman Campagna from one extremity to the other. The two most celebrated monasteries in Italy—that of Monte Casino in the valley of the Liris, and that of Farfa on the Sabine hills—alike fell victims to their fury. Numerous minor convents shared the same fate; and Rome was crowded with priests and monks flying from their desolated abodes. The walls of the city afforded them a secure asylum, but they looked down from thence on nothing but smoking ruins and an unpeopled waste. 'The towns, the castles, the villages' (wrote the unhappy pontiff, John VIII.), 'all are gone, together with their inhabitants. Outside the walls all is waste and desolate; the whole Campagna is depopulated; nothing remains for our support, or that of the convents and holy places; all around the city, wherever the eye can reach, not a man, not a child, is to be seen.' One is tempted to suspect such complaints of exaggeration; but there remains sufficient evidence how complete was the devastation of the Campagna at this period. The ravages of the Saracens on the Garigliano were no passing incursion, no hasty storm

sweeping over the land, and then leaving the inhabitants to return to their homes and resume their agricultural labours. They were continued almost incessantly for a period of more than forty years, during which they rendered all cultivation impossible. Natural causes soon contributed to aid in the work of destruction: malaria took permanent possession of the desolated plains, and converted the Roman Campagna into the fever-stricken waste which it has continued to this day.

This mysterious scourge, which was far from unknown even in the most flourishing ages of Rome, had made itself felt with increasing power as the prosperity and population of the city declined; and the neighbouring country became unhealthy in proportion as it became unsafe. Even during the Gothic wars the army of Vitiges suffered severely from its encampment without the walls in the unhealthy Campagna; and on many occasions through the middle ages the ravages of fever in the invader's camp were among the most efficient auxiliaries in the defence of Rome. The efforts of some of the more enlightened pontiffs, in periods of comparative tranquillity, were repeatedly devoted to the restoration of the population and culture of the neighbouring provinces; and numerous agricultural settlements had been made with this view under the name of '*domus cultæ*,' which appear to have resembled very much those established in the last century by Pius VI. with the same object. But all these were swept away by the destructive ravages of the Saracens; and their very sites are, in many instances, as uncertain as those of the petty cities of Latium.

The devastations of the Saracens were carried up to the very foot of the walls of Rome, but they never penetrated within that barrier; and during the ninth and tenth centuries the city itself was left to the silent and gradual operation of the various destructive as well as renovating agencies which have been already indicated. The next great catastrophe which changed the aspect of Rome, and stamped its impress on the city for all future time, was brought about by the arms of a Christian potentate, who appeared as the ally and defender of the pontifical throne. The capture of Rome by Robert Guiscard, in 1085, renders the eventful reign of Gregory VII. as important an epoch in the material history of the city as it constitutes in the ecclesiastical history of Europe. All the historians of the city are agreed in estimating that more damage was done to the monuments and edifices of Rome by the Norman prince than by all former invaders.

This is no place to dwell upon the memorable career of Gregory VII., or the history of his long-protracted contest

with the Emperor Henry IV.; but the events which marked the close of that struggle had so direct and important an influence upon the fortunes of the city, that they claim a brief notice. For a time fortune appeared to favour the side of the German emperor, who was burning to avenge his humiliation at Canossa by inflicting similar disgrace upon the Roman pontiff. Nothing can afford a stronger evidence of the indomitable energy of Hildebrand than the inflexible resolution with which he maintained the defence of Rome against the emperor through a siege of nearly three years' duration; and the ascendancy of his powerful spirit is shown in the devotion with which the Roman people, usually so little disposed in favour of their spiritual lords, clung to his standard for so long a period with unprecedented firmness. After a siege of seven months Henry succeeded in surprising the walls of the Leonine City, and after a sanguinary combat made himself master of St. Peter's; but Gregory made his escape to the Castle of St. Angelo, from whence he continued to defy the arms of his enemies. The Romans still remained faithful to him, but in vain endeavoured to induce the stern pontiff to listen to terms of conciliation. Repeated negotiations were opened, but all without effect. At length the patience of the Romans was exhausted; they concluded a treaty with Henry, and admitted him within their walls. Many of the nobles, however, still adhered to the Papal cause; and they held separate strongholds within the city, which they had fortified with care. Two of the strongest of these were the Septizonium at the southern angle of the Palatine, and the still more celebrated Capitol. But one by one all these separate fortresses fell before the arms of Henry: the Castle of St. Angelo alone held out, in which Gregory had shut himself up, determined not to yield, though now assailed by the combined arms of the Romans and the Germans.

His resolution was not the mere energy of despair; he had already repeatedly invoked the assistance of Robert Guiscard, who at length hastened to his relief with a formidable army, with which that of the emperor was wholly unequal to contend. No sooner were the lances of the Normans seen to glitter on the heights near Palestrina, than Henry hastened to evacuate Rome; and his troops had scarcely ceased to defile through the Flaminian gate, when Guiscard had established his camp at that of the Lateran. The Romans for a time made a gallant resistance; but treachery opened one of the gates to the Normans, who soon made themselves masters of the whole city. For three days long were the streets of Rome the scene of every description of rapine and violence; a despairing outbreak of the

wretched inhabitants on the third day could only be repressed by the most violent exertions on the part of the invaders, who set fire to the houses and thus gave rise to a general conflagration. The whole of the extensive quarter from the Lateran to the Coliseum, at that time one of the most thickly peopled in Rome, was reduced to ashes; and the celebrated churches of San Clemente and the Quattro Santi Coronati, besides many of inferior note, were involved in the general ruin. Another destructive conflagration, though apparently less extensive, had arisen in the Campus Martius immediately after the first entrance of the Normans. It is difficult indeed to estimate the precise amount of damage inflicted. Very few details are preserved to us by the contemporary chroniclers, but they all agree in the broad and general statement that 'great part of the city' was burned and destroyed; and tradition preserved the memory of the catastrophe down to the fifteenth century, when Flavio Biondo, the earliest writer on the antiquities of Rome, sums up its results in the conclusion that the city was then first reduced to the miserable condition in which he himself beheld it.

The injury inflicted by Guiscard was never repaired. It is certain that from this period we may trace the gradual abandonment of the southern quarters of the city, and the removal of the population from the hills to the 'plain of the Campus Martius. The Cælian and the Aventine, both of which had been among the most thickly peopled portions of the city, became almost deserted, a few old churches only continuing to raise their heads in the midst of ruins. The desolate spaces were gradually occupied by gardens and vineyards, which served to veil their dreariness, and, as at the present day, contributed to the picturesque aspect of the ruins which they surrounded, while they silently and slowly co-operated in the work of their destruction. The Palatine appears never to have been occupied by any considerable population; probably the gigantic masses of ruins with which it was still encumbered prevented it from being selected as a convenient site for fresh habitations. The Forum must have been by this time in a state of great decay, though perhaps still retaining its ancient form and character; and it is generally supposed by antiquarians, though on no very conclusive evidence, that the accumulation of the vast masses of rubbish, with which it is now filled up to so great a depth, is derived in great measure from this period. It is very probable that it may then have commenced, but the recent excavations have clearly shown that the successive accumulations of centuries have contributed to the formation of the thick stratum of *débris*

that has served as the floor of the modern Campo Vaccino. The enormous extent of such accumulations in other places is well seen at the back of the so-called Temple of Peace, where they support an extensive garden at a height above half-way up the gigantic arches of the building. Another remarkable instance may be observed in the celebrated church of San Clemente, which appears to have been rebuilt by Paschal II. about the year 1100, when it was found expedient to raise the level of the new church to such an extent that the remains of the ancient edifice, with its columns still standing, were buried to a depth of more than twelve feet beneath the floor of the modern church, where they have only been brought to light within the last few years.

But however great was the damage done to the surviving monuments of antiquity by the Norman prince and his followers, it would be unjust to ascribe to them a greater share than they really bore in the work of ruin. We have no doubt that Gibbon has formed a just estimate when he reckons the domestic hostilities of the Romans themselves as 'the most potent and forcible' of all the causes of destruction. And this cause was never in more active operation than during the two centuries which followed the sack of the city by Guiscard. The custom, which had originated at a much earlier period, of occupying as strongholds and fortifying with additional defences the ancient edifices, whose massive construction might bid defiance to the feeble engines of attack employed in those days, attained to its greatest height in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The rival families, by whose turbulence and ambition Rome was distracted throughout that period—the Pierleoni and Frangipani, the Gaetani and Savelli, the Orsini and Colonnas—had each their separate fortress within the city, and in almost every instance had established themselves in some one or other of the ancient monuments. Thus we find the Coliseum occupied alternately by the Annibaldi and the Frangipani; the Theatre of Marcellus by the Pierleoni, and, after their extinction or decline, by the Savelli; that of Pompey, of which extensive ruins still remained, by the Orsini; the Mausoleum of Augustus became the stronghold of the Colonnas, while that of Hadrian continued to be the citadel, and often the main bulwark, of the Papal Government.

Nor was the practice confined to these more extensive edifices. During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the construction of strong and lofty towers for defence was an expedient resorted to by the nobles in almost all the cities of Italy, and nowhere did this practice prevail more than at Rome. 'To this mis-

'chievous purpose,' observes Gibbon, 'the remains of antiquity were most readily adapted; the temples and arches afforded a broad and solid basis for the new structures of brick and stone.' Almost every ancient building in the neighbourhood of the Forum seems to have been thus appropriated. The Arch of Titus was surmounted by a tower called the *Turris Cartularia*, which became the nucleus of a more extensive fortress, one of the chief strongholds of the Frangipani; the Temple of Janus, in the Forum of Nerva, was occupied by a tower belonging to another member of the same powerful family; the Arch of Constantine had been employed as a fortress as early as the tenth century; that of Severus underwent a still more perilous ordeal, for *half of it* was occupied by one proprietor who erected his tower upon it, while the other half was claimed by another owner, and seems to have been connected with other buildings.

To such an extent had this practice been carried in the thirteenth century, that in 1257, when a general demolition of the towers of the nobility was ordered by the senator Brancaneone, not less than *a hundred and forty* of them were destroyed at one time; and notwithstanding this sweeping demolition, they speedily multiplied again, and became almost equally numerous, so that in the fifteenth century we are told that forty-four towers were standing in one region of the city alone. The damage done by this means to the ancient monuments is incalculable. The materials for the new constructions would often be taken without scruple from some neighbouring ruin; and even where the ancient structure was for a time preserved by being incorporated in the massive tower, it would always be liable to share its fate and be involved in one common destruction. Almost every revolution in the city was accompanied with the overthrow of the strongholds of the defeated faction; and the excited victors would be little likely to regard the difference between the ancient basement and the more recent superstructure.

When Brancaneone, on the occasion already mentioned, endeavoured to restore peace and good order to the city by the extirpation of these nests of lawless robbers, we are told by a contemporary chronicler that he destroyed 'all the ancient palaces that were still standing, the thermæ, the temples, and vast numbers of columns.\*' Doubtless this statement is greatly exaggerated, but it cannot have been without foundation; and in several other instances we have distinct mention of the

\* Albertino Mussato in Muratori. *Rer. Ital. Scriptores*, tom. x. p. 508.

deliberate destruction of ancient monuments. Thus we learn that the Mausoleum of Hadrian, which had still retained its ancient form and character, notwithstanding the numerous sieges that it had sustained, was at length forcibly stripped of its marble casing, after it had been taken by assault by the populace in 1378; they were only prevented from effecting its total destruction by the massive solidity of the central building itself, which defied all their efforts. The Septizonium of Severus had in like manner suffered severely when it was besieged by the Emperor Henry IV.; and though the engines of attack in the middle ages were fortunately far less destructive than our modern artillery, it is difficult to look back upon the perpetual series of assaults to which every building of importance was exposed in those days without wondering that so many survived.

There can be no doubt that the centuries which followed the great catastrophe of 1084 produced a complete change in the aspect of Rome, and that, as it slowly rose again from its ashes, it would gradually assume the character and air of a mediæval city, bristling with towers and studded with churches and monasteries; its population, so scanty when compared with the extent of its walls, crowded into particular quarters, where they dwelt in lofty houses, with narrow and winding streets. When Sixtus IV., in the fifteenth century, first turned his attention to the embellishment and improvement of the modern city, the streets were extremely crooked and irregular, often so narrow that two horsemen could not pass one another, and encumbered moreover with heavy balconies projecting from the houses on both sides, which became a formidable resource in time of civil tumults, when heavy household utensils and missiles of all kinds were showered down from them upon the heads of the combatants below. Hence the Pope is said to have been actuated in part by the same motive which has had so large an influence in the recent improvements of Paris—the desire to render the streets accessible to the operations of troops, without which he could never feel that he was really master of the city.

But we are here anticipating a much later period in the history of the city, and one for which we have not yet the advantage of our author's guidance. In the volumes now before us, M. Gregorovius has brought down the history of mediæval Rome to the close of the twelfth century; it will probably require at least two more volumes to trace the vicissitudes of the city through the period which still separates him from the allotted term of his labours—the capture of Rome by the

Bourbon in 1527. The interval is one both eventful and interesting; and we look forward with pleasure to the period when we shall begin, in company with our able guide, to emerge from the darkness of the middle ages, and to hail the first dawn of an awakened interest in the great relics of antiquity; to take our seat with Poggio Bracciolini on the summit of the Capitoline hill, and survey the ruins around us; and to trace step by step with Flavio Biondo the enumeration of the monuments that still survived when Rome had passed through the long ordeal of the middle ages.

The later portions of the work already published are occupied to a much greater extent than the earlier volumes with the political and civil history of Rome; and there are probably many of our readers for whom these historical narratives will have more attraction than the archæological topics to which we have confined our attention. M. Gregorovius has related the revolutions of the city with clearness and vigour. But the mediæval history of Rome, though not without many striking episodes and romantic incidents, is far from possessing the enduring interest which attaches to that of Florence, of Genoa, or of Venice. There is something at once wearisome and painful in the spectacle which it presents, of a perpetual succession of revolutions without any permanent result, of a people for ever struggling for the appearance of freedom without ever attaining to the reality, and continually seeking in a change of masters that security for good government which they always failed to obtain by their own exertions. It was in vain that the Roman people rose in insurrection by turns against the Pope and against the Emperor; in vain that they drove out alternately their ecclesiastical rulers and their feudal tyrants; in vain that they planted the standard of liberty on the Capitol, and attempted to restore the forms of the ancient commonwealth. For a time, indeed, it seemed as if a brighter prospect had opened before them under the auspices of Arnold of Brescia, by far the most sincere and upright of the popular leaders who at different periods proclaimed the freedom of the Roman people. But it has been remarked, with as much truth as bitterness, that of the reforms which he attempted to introduce 'some were no more than ideas, others no more than words.' After the execution of the noble-minded Arnold himself, who had been basely abandoned by the unworthy Romans, the republic soon sank into anarchy and confusion in the hands of a factious and avaricious nobility, of a corrupt and servile people. The revolution of the twelfth century, which for a brief interval seemed destined to restore the Roman



republic, has transmitted nothing to posterity beyond the title of Senator, which is still borne by the civil governor of Rome under the Papal authority, and the 'Palace of the Senator,' which has, ever since occupied the brow of the Capitol.

If we pause to inquire why the Romans never attained to permanent freedom—why those republican institutions which in the very same century produced such brilliant results in the cities of Lombardy, which flourished so long in Tuscany, at Genoa, and at Venice, proved so ephemeral and short-lived in the Papal city—the answer is not hard to find. The Roman people were unworthy to enjoy a liberty which they had not earned, and for which they had done nothing to qualify them. It was the progress of industry that had produced, as well as enriched, the Italian republics. When the cities of Lombardy raised the standard of freedom against Frederic Barbarossa, they were already amongst the most opulent and thriving towns in Europe; and they continued throughout the middle ages to be active seats of manufacturing industry. Pisa and Florence, Genoa and Venice, rose to freedom as well as power by their commercial energy and ability. It is only from industry, and that feeling of independence which industry alone confers, that a people can derive the strength to be free. But the Romans never were an industrious people. As early as the seventh and eighth centuries they began to depend upon foreigners, and the influx of pilgrims had already come to be essential to the prosperity of the Holy City. The pilgrims of those days, among whom were wealthy prelates and barons as well as poor peasants and barefooted friars, were as important to the Romans as are the Russian princes or English 'milordi' at the present time; and foreigners flocked thither to purchase rosaries and relics, as they do in our own days mosaics and cameos. The same characteristic is found again at a later period; and the institution of the jubilee by Boniface VIII., in the year 1300, had the effect of attracting enormous numbers of strangers to Rome, and for a time enriched the inhabitants of the city, while it poured vast sums into the Papal treasury. But all such 'casual riches' will speedily disappear when not recruited by trade or industry; and the translation of the Holy See from Rome to Avignon, only a few years after the celebration of the first jubilee, revealed but too plainly the secret of the poverty of Rome. During the absence of the Papal Court the city declined so rapidly that the population is said to have sunk to 17,000 inhabitants; the streets were half deserted, and even many of the churches were given up to the bats and

owls. The Romans found that they might drive away the Popes, but they could not live without them.

A people so devoid of resources in itself could never hope to be free. The character of the Roman populace in the middle ages is drawn by contemporary chroniclers in the darkest colours, and, with every allowance for the clerical bias by which these writers were actuated, there is abundant evidence to support their charges. A people without industry will necessarily be poor and dependent, and a poor and dependent people will ever be venal and corrupt. The astounding rapidity and suddenness with which their internal revolutions succeeded one another was due in great measure to the fact that the populace were always ready to desert the standard of one leader for that of another who promised them greater gain or distributed his largesses more liberally. Turbulent and seditious among themselves, but envious of their neighbours, they were actuated by a hatred of the rival cities of Tivoli and Tusculum even more bitter than that which they entertained for their priestly governors. But their petty wars with these neighbouring towns, which remind us of the early struggles of the infant Roman republic, could boast of no triumphs, and were repeatedly marked by sanguinary and disgraceful defeats. The battles of Monte Porzio and Viterbo were as calamitous, in proportion to the relative state of the Romans of those days, as had been those of Thrasymene and Cannæ. The ferocious hostility with which they destroyed Tusculum and Albano, when circumstances, rather than the force of arms, had at length thrown these places into their power, and the implacable fury with which they sought to inflict the same fate upon Tivoli, have impressed as dark a stain upon their annals as the shame of their previous discomfitures. It was not without reason that St. Bernard inveighed against them as for ever talking great things, though their deeds were little. The Romans of the present day, for whom we fain would hope that time has better things in store, may look back with pride to the glories of ancient days, but assuredly they will derive little encouragement from the example, and little satisfaction from the recollection, of what their forefathers did in the middle ages.

- ART. III.—1. *Account of the Principal Triangulation of Great Britain.* London: 1858.
2. *Extension of the Triangulation of the Ordnance Survey into France and Belgium.* By Colonel Sir HENRY JAMES, R.E. F.R.S. London: 1862.
3. *An Account of the Operations carried on for Accomplishing a Trigonometrical Survey of England and Wales; from the Commencement, in the Year 1784, to the End of the Year 1794.* By Captain WILLIAM MUDGE and Mr. ISAAC DALBY. London: 1799.
4. *Report of the Select Committee on the Cadastral Survey, ordered by the House of Commons to be printed.* 1862.

A CONTROVERSY has for many years been going on respecting the Survey of Great Britain. The one-inch Ordnance Map, and its numerous inaccuracies, must be familiar to our readers. Every year these inaccuracies increase. Changes are made in the face of the country with a rapidity that leaves the revisions of the Survey Department hopelessly in arrear. The map, when first published, was not correct; and, although by continual care some errors have been eliminated, it is generally agreed that the map is not sufficiently accurate for the requirements of the country.

The question of accuracy has of late years been complicated by a dispute as to the scale on which the Government Survey should be published. One inch to a mile was found too small for anything but a travelling or general map. In 1825, a tene-ment survey was required in Ireland. The scale of six inches to a mile was somewhat hastily selected. The advantages of the six-inch over the one-inch scale soon became evident; but many scientific men were of opinion that even six inches was not large enough. It was then proposed to survey the whole of Great Britain on what is called a Cadastral scale. Twenty-five inches to a mile, or  $\cdot 0004$  of the lineal measure of the ground, the scale upon which Government plans are drawn in France, was that which found most advocates. But its opponents were neither few nor silent. Men eminent in science can be appealed to by both sides, and, until now, no Government has ventured to throw the weight of its authority into the balance. It may be presumed that hesitation is at length at an end. A committee of the House of Commons investigated the subject in 1862, and the late Sir George Cornwall Lewis stated, during

the early part of last Session, that the Cabinet had decided on recommending Parliament to adopt its recommendations.

We propose to disinter the subject from the mass of Blue-books which have accumulated over it, and to state in plain words what is to be done. No subject can become popular while its details are not easily accessible. The Ordnance Survey has been unusually unfortunate in this respect. It has been in progress nearly eighty years. The department intrusted with its conduct has presented an annual report to Parliament; but these reports offer little to attract the attention of the general reader, and were speedily consigned to the limbo of forgotten Blue-books. They were usually honoured, on their appearance, by a paragraph in the daily newspapers, and afforded an opportunity, when the Ordnance estimates were under consideration, for a select band of experts to express opinions in the House of Commons, which other members neither understood nor cared to understand. The public had a vague idea that a few country gentlemen wished their estates to be surveyed at the public expense, on such a scale that an English county would cover the floor of Westminster Hall. The opponents of a cadastral survey took advantage of the popular impression; and, as it is more easy to cavil than to argue, and takes less time to make an assertion than to disprove it, the opponents often got the best of the debate. Gradually, the question became involved in a mist of documentary evidence. Select Committees were appointed; and, as every member of a committee can call his own witnesses, no member found it difficult to elicit evidence in favour of his own theory, to which he might triumphantly refer hereafter. Between 1851 and 1863, fourteen Blue-books were presented to Parliament. Among them were the reports of three Select Committees, and one Royal Commission, besides two ponderous volumes of correspondence, and Treasury minutes, papers, and progress reports innumerable. The Committee of 1861 and 1862 succeeded to this rich harvest of Blue-books. The reports of former investigations were submitted to them, and they received oral evidence to fill up any hiatus which they might discover. Their inquiries were limited by the instructions of the House to the single question, whether or not a cadastral survey of Great Britain should be made.

The French term '*cadastral*,' from *cadrer*, to square, has of late years been generally adopted on the Continent, and is now used in England to denote a survey on a large scale. A cadastral as opposed to a topographical map may be defined to be one on which the objects represented, agree, as to their

relative positions and dimensions, with the objects on the face of the country; while a topographical map, drawn on a small scale, exaggerates, for the sake of distinctness, the dimensions of houses, and the breadth of roads and streams; and is, owing to its smaller size, necessarily less correct than a cadastral plan. The Survey of the United Kingdom is in future to be made sufficiently large to admit of its being drawn, or as it is technically called 'plotted,' on the scale of  $\cdot0004$ , or  $\frac{1}{2500}$  of the linear measure of the ground. This scale has been generally adopted throughout those parts of Europe in which a Cadastral Survey is in progress. It corresponds so nearly to twenty-five inches to one mile, that it is usually spoken of as the 25-inch scale. It has the further advantage of bearing within a very small fraction, the proportion of one inch to an acre.

In former days, every survey required by the Government was made separate and independent. Each might be accurate in itself, and the objects represented in each might be placed in their proper relative position; but no place was represented in its exact position with reference to distant objects beyond the limits of the plan which contained it. The country was surveyed piece-meal, like a series of private estates. The first published Ordnance plans of Kent and Essex were drawn with reference to the meridian of Greenwich, those of Devon and Cornwall with reference to the meridian of Butternon Bill, those of Dorsetshire with reference to the meridian of Black Down. It is obvious that a national survey, to be of any value, must be referable to one uniform system of triangulation — in other words, that the survey of the whole kingdom, if put together, should accurately fit, one sheet into another, and represent the actual bearing of every object noted to every other, however distant.

The principal triangulation of the United Kingdom, which was commenced in 1783, was completed only in 1858. It was originally undertaken by General Roy, for the purpose of determining with accuracy the relative positions of Greenwich and Paris. The present energetic director of the Survey Office, Sir Henry James, R.E., enjoys the crowning honour of having connected, in 1862, the triangulation of the United Kingdom with those of France and Belgium. The completion of this work has conferred great benefits on astronomical and geodetical science. It has now been found possible to measure an arc of parallel extending from Valentia, in the west, to the town of Orsk, on the extreme east of European Russia — probably, as the Astronomer Royal has remarked, the longest that will ever be measured by man.

Considering the inaccessibility of the Highlands of Scotland in the early part of the eighteenth century, it is curious that the first operations of military surveying ever undertaken in this country were commenced at Fort Augustus. The Rebellion of 1745, which terminated in the following year at the battle of Culloden, convinced the Government of the day how infinitely important it would be to explore and lay open a country so difficult of access. It was determined to carry roads of communication to the remotest parts of the Highlands, and to establish military posts in their inmost recesses. A body of infantry was encamped, in 1747, at Fort Augustus; and General Watson, then Quartermaster-General to Lord Blakeney, conceived the idea of making a map of the Highlands. The survey was afterwards carried out by General Roy. The original intention was to confine the work to the Highlands; it was extended to the Lowlands, and ultimately comprised nearly all the mainland of Scotland. It was never finished; and, owing to the inferiority of the instruments employed, must rather, as General Roy himself observed, be considered a magnificent military sketch than a very accurate map. The breaking out of the war, in 1755, prevented its completion, and diverted to other services those who had been engaged upon it.

In 1763, the Government for the first time entertained the idea of making a survey of the whole island at the public cost. Many years elapsed before the plan was seriously undertaken. The American war furnished employment to the engineers who would have been intrusted with the work. The authorities waited for the return of peace to commence it. But General Roy had acquired a taste for surveying, and its concomitant arrays of interminable figures and heart-breaking equations, not altogether intelligible to the uninitiated. Whenever he could snatch a moment from his military duties, he occupied his leisure by observing such places as might hereafter prove adapted to the measurement of bases, for the great triangles of a future survey.

Soon after the peace of 1783, General Roy was as usual occupied, *en amateur*, in 'measuring a base of 7,744·3 feet, across the fields between the Jewsharp near Marybone, and Black Lane near Pancras, as a foundation for a series of triangles carried on at the same time for determining the relative situations of the most remarkable steeples, and other places in and about the capital, with regard to each other and the Royal Observatory at Greenwich.' While thus engaged, a message from the King called him to employment more lucrative and

not less congenial. A correspondence had been for some time in progress between the Count d'Adhémar, the French ambassador, and Mr. Fox, in which the former had insisted on the great advantage which would accrue to astronomical science by carrying a series of triangles from the neighbourhood of London to Dover, there to be connected with the triangulation already executed in France. The King had approved of the design, and agreed to bear a part of the necessary expenses. The remaining moiety was to be defrayed by the Royal Society.

General Roy commenced his operations by measuring a base on Hounslow Heath. So careful were his measurements, that they need little correction even when submitted to the rigid scrutiny of modern surveyors. The Hounslow Heath base never became the starting point of a complete system of triangulation; although the survey was gradually extended over the whole island, without system or regularity.

It is, perhaps, hardly necessary to remind our readers of the theory of the process by which a single measured base is made to supply data for calculating unknown distances. If the distance between two given points is accurately known, all that is necessary, in order to ascertain the distance of any point that can be seen from both of them, is to observe successively from each end of the known base the angle subtended by the other end of the base, and the point to be determined. The length of the unknown sides may then be calculated by the formulæ of plane trigonometry, and the distances so determined become in their turn bases for the determination of fresh unknown distances. By constantly constructing new triangles on the sides successively determined, the whole country is at last covered by stations, the positions of which are known with the nicest accuracy. The whole of the principal triangulation which has consumed so many years of anxious toil has been simply a series of repetitions of this proceeding. The simplest instruments would suffice to do this work roughly; the levels, the screws, the verniers, the reading microscopes of the theodolite, are only inventions to secure precision otherwise unattainable. To secure approximate accuracy would be easy enough, but to do it in such a way, that in the whole area of Great Britain—nearly 122,000 square miles—no point fixed by the triangulation shall be more than three, or at most four inches out of its true position, involved an amount of care and calculation not easy to be imagined. The greatest inaccuracy which can possibly be laid to the charge of one of the modern Ordnance surveys is far smaller than the breadth of the finest line that the engraver can make upon the copper-plate—smaller even than the

pancy discoverable in two measurements on the same map on two successive days, when some variation of temperature has stretched or contracted the paper on which it is printed.

The principal triangulation of Great Britain is just completed. The measured bases are on Salisbury Plain, and at Lough Foyle in Ireland; bases for verification have also been measured at Misterton Carr in Nottinghamshire, at Rhuddlam Marsh in North Wales, and at Belhelvie in Aberdeenshire. The two first-named are those from which all the distances in the triangulation have been computed; and such is the accuracy with which the operation has been conducted, that when 500 feet of the Lough Foyle base were remeasured, in the presence of Mr. Babbage and Sir John Herschel, it was necessary to use a microscope to detect the discrepancy between the original measurement and the verification. The actual error demonstrated proved to be one third of the finest dot that could be made with the point of a needle.

The mind is filled with wonder while considering details such as this. The volumes relating to the survey abound with them. It might at first sight appear unnecessary to fill a separate volume with a series of comparisons made between two rival standard yards, especially as the amount of difference ultimately proved to exist is in the ratio of .057 of an inch (about the thickness of half-a-crown) to one mile.

The computed height of the mountain Ben Macdui was 4295.60 feet. The height determined by spirit-levelling up the western side was 4295.70, and by levelling down the eastern side 4295.76 feet. Thus the height arrived at by three independent modes of calculation did not differ in measuring one of the highest mountains in Scotland by more than the thickness of an ordinary boot-heel.

One of the main difficulties of the survey has been to make the triangulation all over the kingdom consistent with itself—that is to say, that the sum of the three angles in every triangle should be  $180^\circ$ , and the sum of all the angles round every station  $360^\circ$ . A moderate appetite for figures might have contented itself with approximations, and considered three unknown quantities in an equation likely to produce a result sufficiently near the truth. The intrepid calculators of our Ordnance Survey, bent upon correcting any discrepancies by the theory of probabilities, have habitually faced the solution of equations with thirty-six unknown quantities. We might multiply these instances of minute attention almost *ad infinitum*. Many similar to those we have just cited are to be found scattered through the volumes detailing the progress of the survey.



The vigilant care of the surveyors appears never to be thrown off its guard from the first setting up of the theodolite at an observing station to the final publication of the map of which that station forms a part; the same patient and toilsome elimination of error, sometimes by the simplest, sometimes by the most ingenious means, goes on. The very setting up of a theodolite previous to the commencement of operations is by no means the simple process that might be imagined. In some instances many feet of bog or sand have to be excavated before a sufficiently firm foundation is reached. Then the firm earth is levelled and rammed. Two sets of scaffolding are built, one inside the other, and carefully isolated; the inner for the reception of the instrument, the outer for the observers to walk on without causing vibration. Similar precautions are taken even on a solid mountain top. At Ben Hutig, in Sutherlandshire, as you may read in the observation-book of the station—

‘Four holes were sunk in the rock, about six inches deep and five inches by three in length and breadth, at equal distances of 1·75 feet from the centre mark of the station, to receive four pieces of wood scantling, upon the heads of which the feet of the table for the instrument were to be screwed. These holes were run with lead, the tops of the scantling cut off and levelled accurately, and further secured against shaking by four horizontal braces nailed near the tops, and also two diagonal ones. Their tops were cut off at the level of the highest piece of rock on which a corner of the observatory rested. . . . A space was left in the centre of the flooring, by which the instrument and its stand were insulated, and not liable to be shaken by any motion above or below it. A batten of wood was nailed upon the extremity of the flooring round the centre space, to keep the feet of the observer from touching the legs of the table of the theodolite.’

Sometimes the theodolite was placed over the top of church steeples, as at Norwich, where it rested over the top stone of the cathedral spire, 315 feet from the ground, and at St. Paul’s, where the theodolite rested over the centre of the cross. In all such instances, two separate scaffoldings were erected one within the other: on the outer the observers moved, and the instrument rested on the inner, so that no possible vibration should disturb its delicate adjustment.

Many of the instruments employed are of great age. The great three-foot theodolite, which was principally used in connecting the triangulation of England with that of the Continent in 1862, and which figured as the frontispiece to the published account of the principal triangulation, was made for General Roy, in 1787, by the celebrated Ramsden. It is now in as

perfect order as when it left the hands of its maker. Considering that this instrument has been in use for seventy-five years, that it has been placed on many of our highest mountains, on our most distant islands, and over the pinnacles of our loftiest churches, the care with which it has been preserved, and the perfection with which it was constructed, are truly remarkable. Mr. Ramsden also made the steel chains, with which three out of the five bases of the triangulation were measured.

We have said enough to show that upon the accurate measurement of a base depends the value of the whole subsequent operations, inasmuch as the most accurate triangulation can only determine that the measured base is contained so many times and parts of a time in a given distance. Any error in the base would, therefore, be repeated in every measurement. It may not, therefore, be out of place to devote a paragraph to describe the mode of procedure.

Deal rods, glass tubes and steel chains, have been successively employed; and although great accuracy was attained by each of these methods, the expansion and contraction both of metals and glass were too great for the delicate nicety required by our surveyors. The rate of expansion of a given bar of metal can be ascertained and allowed for, provided the actual temperature of the bar at the time of observation can be ascertained. But in out-of-door work this cannot be done. The whole mass of the bar is not always of the same temperature throughout, and error, though minute, still exists. A very simple and ingenious invention by Colonel Colby has obviated the difficulty. The rates of expansion of different metals always maintain the same proportion. If a brass rod expands one-fifth more than a rod of iron at a given temperature, the two rods will always maintain the same ratio of four to five, whatever may be the temperature to which they are exposed. A bar of iron and a bar of brass, which are of the same length at a given temperature, are placed parallel to each other, clamped together at their centres, and connected at their ends by small transverse bars, moveable on pivots like the brass transverse pieces on a parallel ruler. There are points in the transverse bars which never move, however much the temperature of the bars and their consequent expansion may alter. At these points, silver plates are let into the transverse bars, and minute dots made to mark the immoveable points.

The modern bases have been measured with compensation bars constructed on this principle. The direction of the base being selected, and the ground levelled, the bars are laid along

it on tressels placed perfectly horizontal by means of spirit levels, and perfectly straight by means of directing sights and a transit instrument. An ingenious expedient has been adopted to lay fresh bars without disturbing those which are already in their places. Two microscopes are fastened together with their foci exactly six inches apart, like a double opera-glass. The microscopes are placed over the bar about to be laid, in such a position that the cross wire of one bisects the dot on the immoveable point, while the other projects six inches beyond it. The bar is then cautiously pushed forward by means of screws until the cross wire of the other microscope bisects the dot on the immoveable point of the bar already laid. The base is thus measured in alternate lengths of ten feet by the compensation bars, and six inches by the double microscopes. The bars already laid are by this plan protected from subsequent disturbance.

The length of the sides in the principal triangulation is from 60 to 100 miles. This principal or primary triangulation is broken up into smaller triangles, which form what is called the secondary triangulation. These, again, are divided into minor triangles, which form the actual foundation of the survey. The length of each side in the tertiary triangulation is usually about a mile.

In some instances, however, sides even longer than 100 miles were measured. These were usually accomplished by the 'helio-stat,' a revolving mirror which reflects the sun from the apex of some distant hill to the observatory. Weeks sometimes elapse before the wished-for gleam comes to make an observation possible. There must be no intervening cloud between the two points; the sun must be shining on the point to be observed, and the watchers who have been anxiously looking for the propitious moment must be on the look-out, unwearied by past days of unsuccess. In this manner Berule, in the Isle of Man, was observed from Snowdon, in Wales, and from Kippure and Slieve Donard, on the Irish shore; and thus, from St. Peter's Church and Fairlight, in Kent and Sussex, triangles were thrown into France and Belgium. The last observations to St. Peter's from Montalembert, in France, were taken in a dense fog. 'This fog,' says the account of the extension of the triangulation, 'which was passing in heavy continuous clouds from the north-east, was seen to break slightly in the direction of St. Peter's, and the helio-stat coming out brightly for about twenty-five minutes, was observed upon two arcs.' There is something almost heroic in the utter simplicity with which

months of hard and scientific work are dismissed in such a sentence.

The severest test which could possibly be applied to the accuracy of the triangulation would, of course, be to start from one of the measured bases, and to travel through the intervening network of triangles to another measured base at a distance, and then to compare the measured with the computed distance; to see what the length of the distant base ought to be, supposing no errors had been committed throughout the whole triangulation, and then to see how far the actual measured distance differs from the distance computed on the hypothesis that the survey was accurate. If the two agree, the work may be considered perfect; if they differ, there must be error somewhere; and the amount of that difference must be the measure of the accuracy of the work. This crucial test was applied to the triangulation a few years ago. Calculations were begun at the Lough Foyle base, and tracked across the country to determine what ought to be the length of the base on Salisbury Plain. The value of half a century of toil, says an observer, hung on the issue of the work; and one can with difficulty imagine the eagerness with which the issue of the trial was looked for. The result was a genuine triumph; the discrepancy amounted only to about four inches and a half in a distance of over 400 miles.

The triangulation of the whole country having been thus completed, and the ends of each line resting on a church steeple, a remarkable rock, tree, or other object, whose position is noted with the delicate accuracy we have already described, the country is covered, from John o'Groat's House to the Land's End, and from Galway to Yarmouth, with a network of imaginary lines, each of which has been measured, and its position recorded, with the utmost possible minuteness. It is obvious that the triangulation, when completed, is a work done for good and all; that, in order to obtain a map of any portion of the country, any one of these triangles, or any series of them, could be easily filled up by a detailed survey, on whatever scale, large or small, might be desired; and that every object noted in such survey would be in its proper place relatively to every other object, throughout the whole country.

Having, then, the materials for a survey on any scale that may be considered advisable, the question that remained to be considered is the kind of survey to be undertaken. The one-inch map finds few defenders; it is inaccurate, many of the plates are nearly worn out, all are behindhand when compared with the high scientific standard of the present time. It was,

many years ago, used as a *corpus vile*, upon which young officers of Engineers tried their 'prentice hands, and learnt surveying in the field by actual experiment. The plan was advantageous for the young officers, but did not increase the value of the map. At the peace of 1815, the survey, which was considered solely in the light of a military work, was abandoned; but the gentlemen of Rutlandshire, who wished for a good hunting map, subscribed a considerable sum towards the expense of continuing the survey, and persuaded the Government once more to undertake it. The military staff was, however, no longer available. It was handed over to private surveyors, each of whom was paid by the piece, and consequently had a direct interest in making his work appear as large as possible. There was in those days no uniform system of triangulation, by which errors of individual surveyors could at once be checked. It was found that, when the work was put together, the triangles overlapped each other in the most absurd manner. In addition to all these drawbacks, there is the inherent objection, which may be advanced against all small topographical maps, that, for the sake of distinctness, it is necessary to omit many details and distort others. Roads and streams are widened, and their course only approximately noted. This, unimportant in a mere travelling map, destroys its value as a record of property. The wayfarer would not much care whether the stream he crossed was depicted a quarter of a mile to the right or left of its true position; but the squire, whose property is bounded by the stream, would be less indulgent when he found in the Government map a practical illustration of Hotspur's angry exclamation:—

' See how yon river comes me cranking in,  
And cuts me from the best of all my land  
A huge half-moon, a monstrous cantle out.'

The organisation of the Survey Department is a beautiful specimen of order evolved out of chaos. Colonel Colby when he took charge of it in 1820 found all in confusion. The contract plans were of no use, and the officers of the department which he proceeded to organise had not only to insert additions, but to revise and correct the plans themselves, before they could be published. Colonel Colby, writing in 1840, twenty years after the commencement of his labours, stated that this part of the work was not then completed, and that its progress had been slow, laborious, and unsatisfactory in its results. In 1863, forty-three years from the commencement of the revision, and the formation of the Survey Department, the last sheets of the revised one-inch map are still

unpublished, though the re-survey is complete. During those forty years the face of the country has undergone innumerable changes—hardly a square mile remains the same as it was in the days of the military pupil surveyors and the contract surveyors; our readers may therefore judge whether the plans which, according to Colonel Colby, ‘in very few instances ‘possessed the original accuracy which would have fitted them ‘to form the kind of map which was required by the country,’ are now, even with the help of industrious patching, in any degree satisfactory.

In 1825 a survey of Ireland became necessary. Colonel Colby, taught by the mistakes which were still embarrassing the English survey, strongly urged the Government to have Ireland surveyed on a large scale. It was a new thing in the history of surveying. A general survey of a country so large as Ireland, every part of which should be as accurate as the detail plans of a small estate, had never yet been attempted. The ordinary processes of surveying were wholly inadequate for the purpose. Colonel Colby’s first labour was to devise a system for its execution, and to obtain the necessary authority for carrying the work into effect. The Duke of Wellington afforded every assistance; a portion of the corps of Royal Engineers was detailed for the service, and, as it was found impossible to procure ready-trained surveyors, Colonel Colby set about the formation of a staff to carry out his views. The military officers, who were unaccustomed to the valuation of land, failed to comprehend the importance of fastidious proofs of accuracy, such as Colonel Colby’s instructions enjoined. They had been taught military surveying. They knew that such accuracy could not be required for any military purpose. They had the severe personal labour of training all their assistants. Besides the Sappers and Miners, they had under them many civilians who had been surveyors, and who all objected to the severe tests their work had to undergo. The work proceeded, to use Colonel Colby’s own expression, ‘with appalling slowness, while the ‘country was demanding unattainable celerity.’ The officers importuned the director-general to relax the severity of his instructions, and to allow them to proceed with the work to satisfy the country. There was difficulty in maintaining the discipline of the soldiers; assistants left them half trained. The labour of teaching them seemed endless and unprofitable. An appeal was made from Colonel Colby to the Master-general, an investigation was ordered, Colonel Colby’s instructions were partly rescinded, and the plans advanced with more rapidity. The land-valuers under the Irish Government commenced their valuation, using

the Ordnance plans; but they soon began to complain of errors and to ask for additional details. A costly revision of the plans was now unavoidable. Colonel Colby's original instructions were again considered, and restored to complete operation. Some time naturally elapsed before the surveyors could be induced to forego their erroneous method of work, and be trained to habits of rigid accuracy. But here the advantages of military organisation became evident. The officers of Royal Engineers, and the non-commissioned officers and men of the Sappers and Miners, laboured to carry the instructions into effect with unflinching determination. The zeal and resolution of the head of the survey were at last rewarded, for the map produced on a scale of six inches to the mile is admitted by competent judges to be the finest work of topographical art ever seen in any country.

The one-inch survey of England was begun in the south. It had reached the southern boundaries of Lancashire and Yorkshire, when the Irish survey was commenced. The immense advantage of the 6-inch over the 1-inch map caused a considerable pressure to be put on the Government, to induce them to extend the advantages of the large scale survey to Scotland, and to those parts of England which yet remained unsurveyed on any scale.

The survey was therefore continued in Yorkshire, Lancashire, and part of Scotland, on the same scale as in Ireland. But as the tencement survey in Ireland approached completion, practical men expressed an opinion that even the 6-inch scale was not sufficiently large. They argued that the 6-inch plan was too large for a mere map, and too small for the purposes to which a cadastral plan can be applied. Sir Charles Trevelyan, who was then at the Treasury, decided on inviting scientific gentlemen interested in the subject, to express their opinions as to the scale upon which a national survey ought to be carried on.

About this time a statistical conference was held in Brussels under the authority of the Belgian Government. The principal states of Europe sent delegates, and the question of national maps or cadastres formed one of the principal subjects of discussion. Mr. Farr was appointed to attend the conference by the Registrar-General. The unanimous opinion of the statisticians who attended the congress was in favour of the scale of  $\frac{1}{25000}$  or  $\frac{1}{2500}$  of a mile; and they also recommended that the large cadastre or plan should be accompanied by a more general map, under the title of a 'tableau d'assemblage,' on a something like that of our Irish survey.

The opinions of the statistical congress in no degree influenced Sir Charles Trevelyan's correspondents, for, although letters poured in from all quarters, the opinions they conveyed were widely divergent. Sir Charles, as it would appear, became frightened at the monster he had created, and requested Sir John Burgoyne, Mr. Blamire, and Mr. Rendel to read and report upon the communications which had been addressed to him. The committee published all the letters in an enormous Blue-book, to which we direct the attention of any students who may possess a taste for tough reading and for a pleasing conflict of opinions. The committee declared the weight of evidence contained in the correspondence to be decidedly in favour of a scale of  $\frac{1}{2500}$ ths of the linear measure of the ground. This was the first time that the 25-inch scale, upon which our future cadastral survey is to be constructed, obtained any official recommendation. The question was, however, by no means settled as yet. It is true that the survey of Scotland was at once commenced, and it was decided that the result should be drawn on the 25-inch scale for the cultivated districts, and 6 inches for the uncultivated districts. It was also arranged that a topographical map should be made on a scale of one inch to a mile. But these decisions were several times suspended, and were more than once reversed by the special intervention of Parliament. Mr. Edward Ellice in 1856 moved a reduction of the vote for the Ordnance Survey, on the ground of his objection to the 25-inch scale. The motion was rejected on a division. But in the following year Sir Denham Norreys brought forward and carried a resolution, in Committee of Supply, with the same object, but in such a form as utterly to paralyse the survey, and contradict the resolution come to by the House in the previous year.

Sir Denham Norreys, in making his motion, put a series of amendments on the notice paper, explaining its object. When the debate was over, the question, in consequence of the peculiar forms of the House, then in Committee of Supply, could only be put, and the division taken, in the following form: 'That the words 151,744*l.* be left out, and 115,744*l.* inserted instead thereof.' The resolution in this unexplanatory form was carried, and the vote for the cadastral survey struck out; but no plan of procedure was substituted for that which was rejected. As far as the journals of Parliament are concerned, it appeared that the House had sanctioned the 25-inch scale by rejecting Mr. Ellice's resolution, but had refused the money necessary for carrying on the work. The department was involved in a dilemma; the only course which could be pursued,



was to dismiss the working parties. A large sum of public money was wasted by the change. When Lord Elcho's Committee reported against the 6-inch scale, the working parties were broken up, and set to work on the 1-inch map. When the large scale was re-established, the 1-inch map was thrown aside. When Sir Denham Norreys's resolutions were carried, the working parties were again withdrawn. It appears in the evidence given by Sir Henry James before Lord Bury's Committee in 1862, that 30,000*l.* has been wasted in the last thirty years, owing to the perpetual changes that had been made from one scale to another.

The Government in this embarrassment determined to issue a Royal Commission, 'for the purpose of inquiring into the subject of the Ordnance Survey, and the scale or scales upon which the maps and plans of the United Kingdom should be drawn and published.' Lord Wrottesley was in the chair, and it was anticipated that the high authority of the individuals composing the commission would set the question at rest for ever.

The Report of the Royal Commission contained recommendations that the one-inch map of the United Kingdom should be forthwith completed, engraved, and published, and that the question of surveying the whole kingdom should be again brought immediately under the notice of Parliament, and left to its discretion. At the same time the Commissioners amassed a considerable amount of information bearing on the subject, and the evident bent of their minds was towards the resumption of the cadastral scale. In consequence of the recommendation of the Royal Commission, a committee of the House of Commons was appointed, in 1861, for the express purpose of deciding whether the cadastral or large scale survey should or should not be extended over the whole of the United Kingdom. The committee reported in 1862: firstly, That it was desirable that the cadastral survey should be extended over those portions of the United Kingdom which are now surveyed on the scale of one inch to a mile only; and, secondly, that it was most advisable that a steady annual grant should be made for the purposes of the survey, which should not vary from year to year. The announcement made by Sir George Lewis, that in future years the survey will be conducted in accordance with the report of the committee of 1862, gives us reason to hope that the conclusion arrived at after so many years of deliberation, and such constant changes, will not again be disturbed.

The cost of a survey, such as is recommended by Lord Bury's Committee, is stated to be 1,400,000*l.* This appears,

even for such a work as a national survey, a large sum. We therefore examine with some curiosity the grounds upon which the committee report their belief 'that large as may be the cost ' of a cadastral survey, the national advantages of such a survey ' are so great that to complete it would be a judicious outlay of ' public money.'

We shall probably make this more intelligible if we trace the various processes which are performed before a map can be placed in the hands of the public. The reader will remember that the triangulation determines accurately the position of any plot of ground with reference to all other parts of the kingdom. We will suppose that a part of Norfolk is to be surveyed, and published on the three scales recommended by the committee. The position of the district to be mapped is first found and marked off on the principal triangulation. The surveyor on his arrival finds the position of some of the principal objects, such as steeples, and remarkable trees or rocks, already determined, and their distances from each other recorded with absolute precision, any one of the lines of the principal triangulation affords him a base line for his survey, and all he has to do is to fill up the minor or tertiary triangles with an accurate description of the country which they contain. The men chain along the sides of the minor triangles, leaving piquets in the ground as they proceed, in such positions as they think most convenient for taking the details of the survey. They note in their field-books every fence, stream, or other object they may cross. They then measure cross lines from one side of the triangle to the other, and by taking offsets from the measured lines to every object on the face of the country, they obtain in their field-books the data for plotting accurate plans of the country upon any scale that may be required. The length of every measured side of a triangle is thus checked by the computed trigonometrical distance, and the accuracy of the lines within each triangle is checked by plotting. The distances being computed from the base line, the authorities know to the fraction of an inch the length of each side, and can therefore at once, when the field-books come in, ascertain whether the chaining of the surveyors is accurate; and when the field-work is fitted on to the plan of the triangulation, previously prepared in the office, the slightest inaccuracy is at once detected, as the cross lines would not fit into their places unless they were exactly of the proper dimensions. It follows, therefore, that although the surveyors are not actually watched, a thorough check is obtained upon the quality as well as the quantity of the work.

The surveyor's field-books are sent to the head office at

Southampton, where they are examined and checked, and the work at once paid for by the director of the survey. The materials are now at hand for a map of the district just surveyed on any scale that may be required. Here we may note one of the errors into which the opponents of a large scale survey often fall. 'No doubt,' they say, 'a large scale survey is a useful thing; but wait until you have completed the 1-inch map before you talk of beginning it. Your large scale survey will take twenty years; do not throw aside your 1-inch map in order to grasp at a magnificent though somewhat chimerical result.' The argument results from a confusion between the survey itself, which is made on the ground, and the plotting of the survey, or map-making, which is done in the office. When once a survey is made, when once the actual distances of objects from each other, and their relative position, are noted down, a map can be made, embodying the facts so obtained on any scale, provided the original survey has been sufficiently accurate to afford the necessary data. 'A Parent survey,' says the committee of 1862 in their report, 'can be diminished, but cannot be increased.' A survey made for the express purpose of being plotted on the 1-inch scale could not with any advantage be plotted on the 25-inch scale, not because the information actually contained would be inaccurate, but because it would not be sufficiently detailed—on the other hand, a survey made for the purpose of being published on the scale of twenty-five inches to a mile, could with ease and propriety be published on the scale of twelve, or six, or even one inch to a mile, merely leaving out, for the sake of distinctness, more and more of the minor details, as the scale on which it was reproduced diminished.

The surveyor's life among the hills and streams is not without its romance and its dangers. The tourist and the sportsman often come, in some out-of-the-way spot in the Highlands, on the little camps of a surveying party, or some solitary sapper, patiently turning his looking-glass, to 'flash' his position to observers on some far distant hill. Few, however, would imagine the amount of patient toil which has produced the scientific result of which England is so proud. The whole survey force consists of about 1500 men, in which four companies of Royal Engineers are employed, forming a military nucleus which keeps all in order. The non-commissioned officers of this force are men of most trustworthy character, and, indeed, often of very considerable scientific attainments. The private journal of one of them, part of which we have been permitted to peruse, bears evidence of no inconsider-

able literary and descriptive power, and the keenest appreciation of the natural beauties which lay in rich profusion around his nomade camp. Occasionally the mountain winds raise storms so violent as to subordinate the admiration of the most enthusiastic lover of the picturesque to a sense of personal insecurity. The party on Ben Auler, in 1840, sustained repeated loss from camp wrecks. Wooden houses were erected instead of tents; but in vain, for the strongest of them was carried away by the wind, and the pieces together with its inmate, Serjeant Steel, scattered over the hillside. On another occasion, at Sleeve Donard, in Ireland, Corporal Forsyth was blown out of the observatory by the wind, and dashed against the rocks. Fortunately he recovered from his wounds. More tragical is the story of Sapper Pemble, a man noted many years for his endurance in mountain marches. His own touching prophecy, that he 'must die on the trig,' was literally fulfilled, for on his way back to camp, after building a cairn on one of the Peebleshire hills, he lay down to rest beside a mountain stream, and perished.

The corps might almost in some cases borrow the motto of the Royal Marines—'Per mare per terras'—for the diaries give accounts of 'strange adventures happed by land and sea' among the islands of the north-west of Scotland. Many of these islands are omitted from all maps, and appear to have been unknown or unregarded by our geographers. Rona and Salusker, for instance, though possessing a considerable quantity of land fit for cultivation, are so precipitous and inhospitable, that no living thing abides there but a few sheep who run wild over the rocks. A surveying party was sent there a few years ago to complete a series of observations for latitude. They set sail from the Scilly Islands in a fishing-smack, and after putting into Stornoway for provisions, were landed on Rona, in a little more than a fortnight. The weather became suddenly unsettled, the vessel, with the camp and the heavy instruments on board, was forced to return to Stornoway, leaving the party on the island with no shelter but their wearing apparel and a boat-sail. Eight days and nights of perpetual storm were spent by the castaways on that rock before another landing could be effected. The zenith sector was at last got into position, and a camp-hut formed. By midnight on the sixteenth day, 173 observations had been recorded, and the astronomical part of the expedition was completed. The topographical survey still remained to be made; the astronomical instruments were re-shipped and sent off for Stornoway, while the surveyors proceeded with their triangulation. No sooner was the vessel out of sight than it was

found that the stock of provisions was insufficient. Tempestuous weather kept the party prisoners for more than a month from the time of their landing; and had it not been for the sheep, to which they resorted when hard pressed by hunger, the unfortunate surveyors would have starved within sight of the Scottish coast.

As soon as the surveyor's work has been examined and approved, it is plotted, or drawn on paper, upon the 25-inch scale. The plan is traced with lithographic ink upon tracing paper, which is thinly coated with starch or paste. Subdivision of labour has been introduced to such an extent that the outlines are traced by boys, who pass the plan on from room to room, where successive boys put in the woods and figures with stamps of various sizes and descriptions. Only the writing and a few details requiring some taste in drawing are traced by draftsmen. The tracing when completed is laid face downwards on a zinc plate, which, owing to the cheapness and lightness of the metal, is now usually substituted for lithographic stones, and is passed through the printing press. The tracing paper is then peeled off, and the ink adheres to the plate, to which the drawing has been thus transferred. The plate is etched and printed, as in ordinary lithography. It is found cheaper and more convenient to erase the drawing when the required number of copies has been printed, and to reproduce it by the anastatic process when a fresh demand arises, than to keep the plates in store. The anastatic process is a patent invention by which any point originally made with greasy ink can be reproduced. Any copy of the original map can thus be transferred to zinc, and printed from in the same way as was done with the original tracing.

The 25-inch plan is now completed; but it is also to be published upon the 6-inch and 1-inch scales. Here comes into play a new and beautiful invention, which appears likely to present enormous advantages to the reproduction of prints, deeds, rare books, and such-like matters—namely, Photozincography, which was invented by Sir Henry James, the director of the survey. By Photozincography a photographic negative is transferred to a metal plate, and printed. When it was first proposed to introduce three scales into the national survey, Sir Henry James became convinced, that unless some more expeditious and less expensive method of reducing plans were invented than that by the pentagraph—the only method then in use—the work would proceed far too slowly, and be too expensive to satisfy the public. Experiments were instituted in Paris in 1855 by Sir Henry James, to ascertain whether photography could not be successfully applied for the purpose. The result was satisfactory. Two sappers were instructed in

the art of photography, and this branch of the work was placed, on Sir Henry's return to Southampton, in the hands of Major Elphinstone, R.E., V.C., who soon brought it to great perfection.

A copy, on the 25-inch scale, of the plan to be reduced is attached to a board, and the camera is placed on a table which runs on a small tramway laid down on the floor of the photographic room. The table is then moved till a rectangle on the reduced scale, traced on the ground-glass on the camera, corresponds exactly to the rectangle of the plan to be reduced. The curvature of the image is obviated, by reducing the diaphragm in front of the lens to a small aperture. The ordinary collodion process is employed in taking the negative, which is then treated as in ordinary photographs. Sir Henry James's invention consists in transferring the photograph itself to a zinc plate, for the guidance of the engraver; instead of tracing it, as was done at first, and then transferring it to the zinc by the anastatic process. Sir Henry James gives full details of the invention, and specimens of the purposes to which it can be applied, in his recent work on Photozincography. The plans thus reduced and transferred to copper are etched and engraved in the ordinary way. Copper plates are always used for maps on the 6-inch scale, as the beautiful lines traced by the graver cannot conveniently be produced on the rougher surface of the zinc plate. A considerable saving in the cost of engraving the Ordnance maps is effected by using steel punches to cut the wood figures and rocks on the copper plates; the work is done much more quickly, and much more neatly, than by hand, and boys are employed at it in the place of skilled engravers. The writing is put in by a patent machine, and the parks and sands ruled by machine with a steel dotting wheel; the proportion of skilled labour in the actual production of the work, when once the thing to be produced has been settled, is thus reduced to a minimum.

The 1-inch map is reduced by photography from the engraved copy of the 6-inch map, in the same way that the former is reduced from the 25-inch, the only difference being that for the 1-inch map the hill features are shaded in by a draftsman upon a copy of the 6-inch map, and reduced for the engraver by photography.

The plates, at different stages of their progress, and also when completed, are electrotyped. By this means, not only duplicate and absolutely facsimile copies of the plates unworn and perfect are kept in the office, but copies of them being taken at different stages of progress, different classes of informa-

tion can be engraved upon a map the same in all other respects. One map is completed with contour lines, another with the hill features engraved, another with the geological lines. Two or more plates can also be joined together, and when reproduced by the electrotpe form a single plate to print from. In this way, maps of several counties in Scotland have been formed, to serve as indexes to the 6-inch maps. In one instance, no less than seven plates were so joined. It would not, of course, be possible to join the plates of the original one-inch English map, as the survey was not laid down on any one projection, but by the method of parallels and perpendiculars to different meridional lines in different parts. Electrotyping is also applied with good effect to the correction of faulty maps. When once the lines have been cut by the engraver in intaglio on the copper, it is a long and tedious process to burnish out the peccant lines without injuring the rest of the work. An electrotpe copy presents every line on the original in relief, instead of in intaglio; and it is thus quite easy to scrape away the lines which are to be erased. Another electrotpe is then taken, which presents the lines as before in intaglio, and upon this the engraver works as upon the original plate.

We thus see that, provided only the original field-books are sufficiently accurate and detailed in their information, you have in one operation materials for maps on every scale and of every kind. The question is merely this, whether the increased expense of making the first survey absolutely accurate and ample in detail, counterbalances the disadvantages of having to make a special survey whenever a map of any kind is required? The committee, as we have seen, contend that even on the ground of economy a cadastral survey is desirable. If the high authorities who gave evidence before them are to be trusted, sums of public money have already been uselessly expended in imperfect surveys which would have paid for a cadastral plan twice over. Nor have we any assurance that similar waste will not take place in future. Such must of necessity be the case unless the work is at once done thoroughly once for all. We will cite a couple of instances. In 1842, the Tithe Commutation Commissioners, being under the necessity of making maps for tithe purposes, wrote to the Government, strongly urging that the plans which were necessary for their operations ought to be made referable to a uniform system of triangulation, and be drawn in such a manner as to form part of a national work. Their advice was disregarded, and plans were drawn to meet the immediate requirements of the commissioners. The result has been that the same commission, having

had its operations extended to other purposes connected with the land, such as superintending the application of the drainage loans, the enfranchisement of copyholds, the exchange of lands, and the reapportionment of tithes, endeavoured, but without success, to adapt the tithe maps, which had cost about two millions of money, to their new requirements. Fresh surveys had to be made. These, having the same radical defect, are as useless for general purposes as the tithe maps. Only one-sixth of the 12,000 maps which exist in the office of the Tithe Commissioners have any pretensions to accuracy. Even these, not being referable to any uniform triangulation, are not available as part of a national survey. Many districts which were surveyed by the Tithe Commissioners had shortly afterwards to incur the expense of a second survey for the Enclosure Commissioners. Colonel Dawson, one of the commissioners, stated that at the time when he gave his evidence the Enclosure Commissioners had only just begun their labours, and that even then 40,000*l.* had been expended, which would have been saved if the tithe maps had been part of a general survey. He expected a much larger expenditure in the same way. In 1845, the great railway year, there was a large demand for the tithe maps for railway purposes. They were, however, found quite useless. ‘Hundreds of thousands,’ says Colonel Dawson,—‘I might almost say millions—were expended, independently of the lines that were carried out, on surveys for ‘lines that were got up in a hurry, and abandoned for want of ‘proper maps.’ The Hydrographer to the Navy states that a proper cadastral survey would save in many cases one-half, and in all cases two-fifths, of the expense of the hydrographical survey. These are instances in which it is possible to adduce direct evidence of public money being actually spent which would have been saved if a cadastral map had existed.

The amount of money thus actually wasted cannot at the most moderate computation be set down at less than three millions and a half; and it is idle to speculate on the enormous sums which have been spent on useless surveys not mentioned to the committee. Colonel Dawson told the committee that many localities which had been taxed for the tithe maps, and again taxed for the Enclosure Commissioners’ maps, had almost immediately afterwards to be resurveyed by private persons, in consequence of the inaccuracy of both maps, when the property contained in them changed hands.

In Ireland the Ordnance Survey has been used as the basis of the valuation according to which all local assessments and taxes are levied. The income-tax has been levied by it, and with so



much advantage to the public purse, that Sir Richard Griffith, in a letter to the Royal Commissioners of 1858, before the Irish survey had been completed in the northern counties, writes as follows:—

‘The income tax is at present collected by it except in five of the northern counties, the valuation of which, in tenements, has not yet been completed by me, and in those counties the tax is still collected according to the Poor Law valuation. Had the tenement valuation been completed in those five counties, the receipts by the public, for income tax alone (calculated at the rate of *7d.* in the pound), would have exceeded the amount collected under the Poor Law valuation by about 48,000*l.* a year.’

It is surely impossible to bring more direct evidence than this to prove the advisability in an economical point of view of a cadastral survey.

The principal expense and trouble has been in the triangulation. That once completed, the additional expense of a survey fit to be plotted on a cadastral scale is comparatively trifling. Indeed, the expenses of publication on the 25-inch and the 6-inch scales is the same for an equal area. One sheet or plan on the 25-inch scale contains 960 acres. It is produced inexpensively, by simply reversing a tracing on to a zinc plate. The sale of twenty-five impressions pays for its cost, which is about 4*l.* One sheet on the 6-inch scale contains 24 square miles—that is, sixteen times as much as one sheet on the 25-inch scale—its cost is 64*l.*, or sixteen times as much as the other. The cost for an equal area of the survey is, therefore, the same on one scale and on the other.

One of the greatest obstacles to the successful completion of the survey has always been the uncertainty under which the director remained as to the funds which in any one year would be at his disposal. One year he had a grant of 122,000*l.*, the next it was reduced to 64,000*l.* The consequence of course was that large numbers of draftsmen were suspended, field-surveyors were disbanded, working parties were recalled, and the whole establishment placed on a reduced footing. The skilled labour of the surveyors’ department cannot be obtained in a moment. The surveyors must be trained by a considerable course of practical instruction. Nothing can be promised with certainty as to the time in which the survey would be completed, or the sum it would cost, unless the director were assured that the sum to be placed at his disposal should not vary in amount from year to year. One of the principal recommendations of the committee of 1862 was, that the amount to be expended on the survey from year to year

should not vary, but should remain in each year steadily the same. It was found that, taking the average of the last ten years, 90,000*l.* was the annual amount which had been voted. The committee, therefore, recommended that the vote should be in future 90,000*l.* a year. With that sum at his disposal, Sir Henry James has undertaken to complete the north of England and Scotland on the scale now in progress, and the south of England on the 25-inch scale,—in other words, to extend the cadastral survey over the whole of the British Islands—in twenty-one years. He has further stated that the survey could be completed in twelve years if the annual grant were increased to 150,000*l.*

A public map ought to give accurate information on matters relating to the transfer of land, the registration of titles, the valuation of property for local taxation, transactions affecting land as between landlord and tenant, improvement or reclamation of waste lands, engineering works, such as military plans, hydrographical, geological, and railway surveys, the construction of roads and canals, and great systems of drainage. All these important public objects are attainable to the full extent only when the plans on which they are based are sufficiently large to allow of accurate measurements being made upon the map itself, and sufficiently detailed to afford all the data for estimating or carrying on the necessary works.

With regard, first, to the transfer of property. The difficulties which now surround the subject, apart from the question of registration of title, arise from the uncertainty which exists as to the accuracy of the boundaries and acreage of the property to be sold. With an authentic Government survey, on which every man's property is shown, and the acreage exactly known, the expense of special surveys for the purpose of the sale is avoided. The most eminent lawyers of the day appear to be unanimous in their opinion that a well-digested system of registration of the title to property is required. Many gentlemen, practically conversant with the subject, consider that the use of public maps is a *sine quâ non* of any such system, and is the only effectual way of lessening the expense of the investigation of title, and promoting conciseness and precision in conveyancing. Both Lord Langdale's Committee on this subject, in 1846, and Mr. Walpole's Commission in 1857, affirm this opinion in their reports. Minute descriptions of parcels of land, in the deed of conveyance, would be unnecessary; and thus all that part of conveyancing which consists of the descriptions of boundaries would be avoided. The advantage of a government over a private map would consist not only in

its accuracy, but in its impartiality. It would be a public record, on the impartiality of which all men would agree, and much litigation would be saved. The government map would, moreover, be a general survey, and not a record of the mere fields or parcels conveyed. There is a field A, a field B, and a field C. In course of time, they are all thrown into one. If these three fields had been conveyed by a deed describing the boundaries, or even by a private map containing only those fields, there might, in course of time, when the hedges were obliterated, be confusion. But a public map would show not only those fields, but all the fields, hills, and rivers around; and the area of the three fields conveyed would at once be open to identification. We may mention a case exactly in point. A Northumbrian proprietor left 500 acres to the Grammar School at Morpeth. But as the 500 acres remained in the possession of the successive owners of the estate, who paid some acknowledgement to the school, all trace of the boundaries became lost, and the school lands merged in the estate. The consequence was a lawsuit, which lasted more than a hundred years. All this would have been prevented, if a large survey had been in existence at the time the grant was made, because the 500 acres might at any time have been identified by measurement on the map. Ecclesiastical lawyers say that ecclesiastical corporations lose more than others by want of good maps. A large amount of their lands is held on copyhold; and the peculiar phraseology of conveyancing, which usually omits to define what part of the estate conveyed is freehold, and what copyhold, is particularly productive of litigation. The manner in which it is regarded on the Continent may be gathered from the words of M. Avila to the Statistical Congress of Brussels:—

‘ Nous proposons finalement que le cadastre soit fait de manière à ce qu’il puisse avec le temps et en vue des règles de la proscription, devenir le titre probant de la propriété; car nous ne voulons pas que le cadastre soit seulement un instrument fiscal: nous voulons que sa mission soit plus élevée; nous voulons que le cadastre soit l’inventaire de la propriété foncière du pays, le grand livre où chaque propriétaire puisse trouver les titres de sa propriété; nous voulons que le cadastre soit la base de la statistique du territoire, de la statistique agricole, du système hypothécaire, du crédit foncier, et, en un mot, de toutes les questions qui concernent la propriété. Nous entendons que sous ce point de vue, l’organisation du cadastre est un des plus grands bienfaits que l’on puisse rendre à un pays.’

It hardly needs the authority of the late Duke of Wellington to prove the advantages which would accrue in a military point

of view from the publication of large-sized plans of the country. He pronounced six inches to the mile to be the smallest size which would give any really useful information. The National Defence Commission has lately ordered a considerable number of surveys for the purposes of that commission; these are all conducted on the 25-inch scale, and being based on the principal triangulation, will fit into any future cadastral plan of the country. About 672,500 acres in England have been resurveyed on this scale; they comprise surveys of the environs of London, the Thames and Medway, the Isle of Wight, Plymouth, Pembroke, Portsmouth, Aldershot, Harwich, Dover, Sandhurst, and many other military stations. It is also obvious that for fortifications, hydrographical surveys, geological surveys, railway surveys and drainage, the cadastral plans afford immense advantages. These advantages are, however, technical in their nature, and we need not dwell upon them. Since the passing of the provisions of the Drainage Act in 1846, several millions of public money have been lent for drainage purposes, and the land improved under the Landed Property Improvement Act, for which so long ago as 1856 1,490,000*l.* had been issued in 3,000 separate loans, has all been carefully laid down on the Ordnance plans. In the hydrographical surveys especially they are of inestimable value. They supply such minute and accurate data, that the surveyor in his offshore soundings is often able to make use of a white-washed house or mill to fix his position, and thus accomplish a good day's work, when, from the trigonometric points being covered up by clouds, or partially obscured by mists, it would otherwise be lost. The hydrographer to the Admiralty reported officially that his ten years' labours on the lochs and sounds of Scotland would have been done in five if a cadastral survey had existed there.

It is impossible to reprobate too strongly the illogical distaste which some members of Parliament have always exhibited to the formation of a cadastral survey. Had they opposed the completion of the triangulation, their opposition would at least have been intelligible. But the triangulation has been completed without remonstrance, and almost without notice. With it the most important part of the work is at an end. The triangles once laid down remain for ever—they can be filled up, as we have shown, on any or every scale. The cost now of a large and accurate survey would be within a fraction as great as that of one smaller but equally accurate. It is not to be supposed that any one would advocate the publication of any map drawn with less than the extreme attainable amount of

accuracy. If so, it were better to put up with the present 1-inch map, disband the surveyors, send the sappers to their duty, and dismiss to other employments the most scientific staff of officers that the world has ever seen assembled together. France and Sweden, Austria, Bavaria, Russia, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Prussia, Sardinia, and Spain, all have their cadastral surveys in different stages of advancement. Let England, who now has by common consent the palm of scientific accuracy, remain content, like Tuscany, Hesse Darmstadt, and Hanover, with small and inaccurate maps, and leave to future generations the care of filling in the details of our unequalled triangulation. Having commenced our tower, it would be disgraceful and absurd to sit down and decline to finish it, not because we are unable to afford the cost, but because we cannot appreciate the value of the completed structure.

It cannot be too often repeated that the really expensive part of the work has been done and paid for, and that a sum equal to the average annual sum which has actually been expended during the last ten years—voted steadily by Parliament, and applied as Sir Henry James well knows how to apply it—will in the course of a few years give us a set of cadastral plans and topographical maps of the British Islands more perfect in accuracy and finish than any that have yet been seen in Europe.

---

ART. IV.—*The Life of Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke, Secretary of State in the Reign of Queen Anne.* By THOMAS MACKNIGHT. London: 1863.

**I**F Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke, cannot be named amongst the worthies of England, he stands in the front rank of her celebrities. The influence he exercised in government and philosophy was more for evil than for good; his course was meteorlike, 'with fear of change perplexing nations;' the light he shed was lurid; but his name is so indissolubly blended with a momentous period of our history, so intimately associated with our Augustan age of literature, that we hail with pleasure every renewed attempt to form an impartial estimate of his genius and character as a statesman, an orator, an author, and a man.

Mr. Macknight is creditably known as a political writer, and his capacity for handling weighty subjects boldly and comprehensively may be inferred from his book on Burke; although

we do not precisely understand why (as he states to have been the fact) that work should have led to the one before us; no two men who have played equally conspicuous parts being less like each other than the author of the 'Patriot King' and the author of the 'Essay on the French Revolution,'—the moral and religious friend of Johnson, and the philosophic prompter of Pope. Neither of them, it is true, has been the subject of a work so written as to preclude rivalry; and Mr. Macknight probably thought that, having contended on equal terms with Mr. Prior, he might without presumption challenge comparison with Mr. Wingrove Cooke, the best and most complete of the previous biographers of Bolingbroke. With evident reference to this competitor, he states that 'the narrative has not been based on 'any former work;' that 'it will be found to differ materially 'from every other publication of the kind in the estimate of 'Bolingbroke himself, in the representation of the most important facts of his life and the motives of his actions, as well 'as in the view of his cotemporaries in relation to himself.'

Mr. Macknight is certainly not an imitator; he chooses his own path, and treads it firmly and confidently. We are also disposed to rely fully on his assurance that he has consulted every accessible book and manuscript on the subject, for his diligence in this direction is proved by the results. But his execution is hardly on a par with his conception: we cannot say of his book *materiem superabat opus*: the contrary would be a nearer approximation to the truth; and in so practised a writer we are not unfrequently at a loss to account for the slovenliness of the style, as well as for the perfunctory manner in which valuable documentary evidence has been sifted and employed. Between him and Mr. Wingrove Cooke, however, the career of their common hero may now be regarded as completely unrolled and emblazoned for the inspection and edification of posterity.

Claiming descent, paternally or maternally, from William St. John, who held a high command in the Norman army at the battle of Hastings, and Adam de Port, a Saxon magnate, Bolingbroke used to boast that he united in his person the noblest blood of both races—the conquering and the conquered. He was born heir to a baronetcy and a good estate; although, in consequence of the long life of his father, he gained nothing by inheritance till his career was verging to its close. The precise day of his birth is uncertain; that of his baptism is October 10th, 1678; and writing on New Year's Day, 1738, he says: 'Some months hence I shall be three score.' We hear nothing of his mother, a daughter of the Earl of Warwick;

and his father, who died an unreclaimed rake at ninety, gladly abandoned the care of his education to his grandmother, Lady St. John, who professed puritanical opinions, and (as the phrase goes) sate under Daniel Burgess. Mr. Wingrove Cooke accuses this divine of downright fanaticism; whilst Mr. Macknight, with, we think, better reason, insists that his many smart sayings should be admitted in mitigation, if not refutation, of the charge. Thus he defined thorough-paced doctrine to be that which comes in at one ear, passes straight through the head, and goes out at the other; and said that the children of Jacob were called Israelites because the Almighty had always hated Jacobites. These gentlemen are also at issue on the degree of weight to be attached to a sentence in one of Bolingbroke's letters to Pope:—'It puts me in mind of a puritanical parson, ' Dr. Manton, who, if I mistake not—for I have never looked ' into the folio since I was a boy, and condemned sometimes to ' read in it—made a hundred and nineteen sermons on the hundred and nineteenth Psalm.' Lord Stanhope's version is, that 'his (St. John's) early education was directed by a puritanical mother, whose imprudent zeal compelled him painfully ' to peruse large tomes of controversial divinity when far too ' young to understand their value, and thus perhaps implanted ' in his mind the first seeds of his aversion to the truths of ' revelation.'

Still we agree with Mr. Macknight, that, if an ascetic system of education was ever meditated or commenced, it was ill continued by sending the lad to Eton, where the habits, manners, and mode of tuition were (as now) essentially of a mundane character. In his 'Memoirs of the Last Ten ' Years of George the Second,' Horace Walpole states that his father and Bolingbroke 'had set out rivals at school;' and Coxe, in his 'Memoirs of Sir Robert Walpole,' relying probably on this authority, says that 'during his continuance at Eton he ' (Sir Robert) had been the rival of St. John, who was three ' years older than himself.' An obvious error in this passage is afterwards corrected by a note, showing that St. John was in fact two years younger instead of three years older. The difference of age either way, as well as the respective habits and characters of the lad, preclude the notion of any marked rivalry at that time; and the contemptuous surprise subsequently expressed by the younger of the two at the other's rising influence in the House of Commons, seems to show that he had not been regarded as a serious competitor in boyhood.

On leaving Eton, St. John was entered of Christchurch Collège, Oxford, where he speedily attracted notice by his

vivacity and versatility, his remarkable quickness of perception, and the variety of knowledge which his prodigious strength of memory enabled him to accumulate by fits and starts during a course of study of the most desultory kind. The late Lord Macaulay used to complain that he could not forget the very exercises he had learnt at school; and St. John playfully alleged a similar tenacity of memory as an excuse for not cumbering his mind with too much book-learning. Under every disadvantage he learned so much that he was suspected of the not uncommon affectation of pretending an unreal idleness. His dissipation, however, was certainly not pretended; it was conspicuous in times which had witnessed the wild excesses of the Wilmots and Sedleys. An old gentleman told Goldsmith that he himself had seen St. John and some of his boon companions running naked through the park, and his connexion with Miss Gumley, the most dashing woman of the day, was notorious before he was well quit of the University. Fortunately, it was then the fashion for men of wit and pleasure about town to cultivate the society of men of letters, and his intimacy with Dryden is illustrated by an anecdote in 'The Lives of the Poets.' On one occasion, when St. John was sitting with the poet, a visitor was announced. 'This,' said Dryden, 'is Tonson.' 'You will take care not to depart before he goes away, for I have not completed the sheet which I promised him; and if you leave me unprotected I must suffer all the rudeness to which his resentment can prompt his tongue.' Johnson must have had a peculiar pleasure in telling the story, for this was the self-same Tonson whom he beat, or (as some said) knocked down with a folio, for impertinence.

A copy of eulogistic verses by St. John is prefixed to the first edition of Dryden's translation of Virgil, and this is supposed to be the embryo statesman's first public appearance in print. It is not a favourable one, and (with perhaps one exception) his subsequent attempts in verse are equally devoid of poetic merit. They were fortunately limited to 'Almahide, an Ode,' produced in 1700, a vapid and laboured affair, in which the writer intimates that after a vain search for the abode of Wisdom and Philosophy, he had returned to the Muses and to love; a prologue to the Earl of Orrery's tragedy of 'Altamira,' and two or three copies of verses to his mistresses. The best of these was addressed to a nymph named Clara, who sold oranges in the lobby of the Court of Requests, which (as may be learnt from the 'Journal to Stella') was then the popular lounging-place. Like Manon Lescaut and La Traviata, she was incorrigible in the vagrancy of her attachments; no



amount of kindness or liberality could keep her faithful to a single lover, and the inevitable consequences are pressed upon her in lines which, in Lord Stanhope's opinion, 'seem to prove' that had he (St. John) applied himself to poetry, he would have 'excelled in it.' In our judgment, the exquisite comparison by which Lord Macaulay illustrates Montague's poetical talents will exactly fit St. John:—'His genius may be compared to that pinion which, though it is too weak to lift the ostrich into the air, enables her, while she remains on the earth, to outrun 'hound, horse, and dromedary. As a poet Montague would 'never have soared above the crowd.'

In the interval between leaving Oxford and entering the House of Commons, St. John passed the best part of two years on the Continent; but little is known of his places of sojourn or manner of life there, except that he spent some time at Milan, and acquired in Parisian society that perfect knowledge of the French language which afterwards led to his having the principal conduct of the negotiations ending in the Peace of Utrecht. Soon after his return, when about twenty-two, he married one of the daughters and coheiresses of Sir Henry Winchecomb, Bart., with whom he obtained property enough to support the station at which he aimed, independently of his grandfather and father, whose estates, however, were included in the settlement. The marriage was not a happy one; for St. John, like his unreclaimed Clara, could not be induced to forswear any of his favourite vices so long as he had health, strength, or money for their indulgence; and among his other titles to fashionable fame, he boasted of being able to swallow, without any perceptible effect on his brain, an almost unlimited quantity of burgundy or champagne. It will be seen that he persevered in the frequent display of this accomplishment at seasons when his full powers of mind and body were tasked to the uttermost by state affairs. 'His youth (says Lord Chesterfield) 'was distinguished by all the tumult and storm of pleasures, in which he licentiously triumphed, 'disdaining all decorum; and his convivial joys were pushed 'to all the extravagancy of frantic bacchanals. These passions 'were never interrupted but by a stronger ambition.' That stronger ambition first came into operation in February 1701, when he entered the House of Commons as member for Wootton Bassett.

Faction never ran higher than during his first Session, which was also the last of the troubled reign of William. The Tories were in the ascendant, and used their strength without mercy or moderation. They passed resolution after resolution, in

open defiance of their own established creed, to restrict the prerogatives of the Crown, because they disliked the dynasty on which it was about to devolve; and they impeached in a lump the whole of the Whig leaders, beginning with the illustrious Somers, the chief author of the great constitutional settlement of 1688-9. St. John forced his way at once into the front rank of the majority, and took the lead in advocating the most violent of their measures; little thinking that the time would come when he would bitterly rue the precedents of a political persecution which he was setting up. When the tables were turned, and his own attainder was under discussion, the course he pursued towards Somers, Montague, and Russell was painfully and spitefully recalled to him; nor did he in his calmer moments attempt to justify what had been done. 'But, my lord, I own it with some shame, because 'in truth nothing could be more absurd than the conduct we 'held.' Such was his avowal, at a long subsequent period, to Lord Cornbury. That a man of two or three and twenty, chiefly celebrated for his excesses, should take up so commanding a position at starting, can only be explained by supposing that his eloquence, being of that kind which depends more on natural gifts than on practice or study, was already of the highest order when he began to test its powers. All accounts agree that his voice and person were eminently adapted for oratorical display; and his writings abound in indications of the rhetorical qualities by which he won his admitted supremacy in debate. Take, for example, a passage from 'The Idea of a 'Patriot King.'

'If a people is growing corrupt, there is no need of capacity to contrive, nor of insinuation to gain, nor of plausibility to seduce, nor of eloquence to persuade, nor of authority to impose, nor of courage to attempt. The most incapable, awkward, ungracious, shocking, profligate, and timorous wretches, invested with power, and masters of the purse, will be sufficient for the work, when the people are complices in it. Luxury is rapacious; let them feed it: the more it is fed, the more profuse it will grow. Want is the consequence of profusion, venality of want, and dependence of venality. By this progression, the first men of a nation will become the pensioners of the least; and he who has talents, the most implicit tool to him who has none. The distemper will soon descend, not indeed to make a deposit *below*, and to remain there, but to pervade the *whole body*.'

Or the following, which Lord Brougham calls 'a noble 'passage,' from the 'Dissertation on Parties:—

'If King Charles had found the nation plunged in corruption; the people choosing their representatives for money, without any other

regard; and these representatives of the people, as well as the nobility, reduced by luxury to beg the unhallowed alms of a court; or to receive, like miserable hirelings, the wages of iniquity from a minister; if he had found the nation, I say, in this condition (which extravagant supposition one cannot make without horror), he might have dishonoured her abroad, and impoverished and oppressed her at home, though he had been the weakest prince on earth, and his ministers the most odious and contemptible men that ever presumed to be ambitious. Our fathers might have fallen into circumstances, which compose the very quintessence of political misery. They might have "sold their birthright for porridge," which was their own. They might have been bubbled by the foolish, bullied by the fearful, and insulted by those whom they despised. They would have deserved to be slaves, and they might have been treated as such. When a free people crouch, like camels, to be loaded, the next at hand, no matter who, mounts them, and they soon feel the whip, and the spur of their tyrant; for a tyrant, whether prince or minister, resembles the devil in many respects; particularly in this. He is often both the tempter and tormentor. He makes the criminal, and he punishes the crime.'

After reading these passages, we can readily believe the tradition that he dictated his compositions to an amanuensis. His periods swell and amplify, as if he was in the full fervour of declamation; and, so far as mere readers are concerned, his writings might be improved by a judicious retrenchment of their redundancies. The fulness and richness of St. John's printed language, however, leave no doubt that he amply fulfilled in his own person what he desiderates in the genuine orator, when he lays down that 'eloquence must flow like a stream that is fed by an abundant spring, and not spout forth a little frothy water on some gaudy day, and remain dry the rest of the year.'

He was by no means a solitary instance, in the last century, of a very young man becoming the mouthpiece of a party, or taking the lead in the conduct of affairs, at his first entrance into public life. The Pitts, father and son, are remarkable examples of this description of precocity; and the phenomenon ceases to inspire wonder, if we reflect on the very different sort of training required for public life in their day; when political economy was in its infancy, and the multifarious social problems based on it, or on our complex system of commercial arrangements and internal administration, were unknown. To be at home in English history and the Latin classics—to be familiarly versed in the commonplaces of civil and religious liberty, prerogative, toleration, standing armies, the Protestant succession, and the balance of power—to have a copious and well-chosen vocabulary—to be well born

or well connected—to be fluent, animated, and bold—was enough, and more than enough, to raise the hopes of an Opposition, or make a Minister look about him; as when Walpole, startled by the *début* of the ‘great Commoner,’ felt the necessity of muzzling ‘that terrible cornet of Horse.’

A modern debater addresses the entire nation through the Parliamentary reporters, and his reputation depends in a great measure on the estimate they may found on the substance of his speeches. St. John had only to satisfy those who were present when he spoke and who were naturally much influenced by form and manner. In his ‘Spirit of Patriotism’ he labours hard to prove from the examples of Demosthenes and Cicero, that all the powers of eloquence, unaided by study and experience, will prove unavailing in the long run; and if he means that they will not make a statesman, a patriot, an enlightened reformer or benefactor of his country, he may be right. But he has shown in another place how great and how baneful an influence might be acquired in the House of Commons by arts, acquirements, and expedients which have no apparent affinity to knowledge or judgment, comprehensiveness or solidity. ‘You know the nature of that assembly,’ he wrote to Windham; ‘they grow, like hounds, fond of the man who shows them game, and by whose halloo they are used to be encouraged.’ The Tory squires grew fond of St. John, much as their successors grew fond of Mr. Disraeli in our time, for giving voice to their antipathies, and hunting down the most respectable of their opponents. In serious argument, and whenever an appeal could be made to reason, justice, or constitutional doctrine, he was invariably worsted by Somers; but his dashing oratory carried all before it in debate; and it was by slow degrees, and by dint of moral courage and unflinching energy, rather than by power of words, that Walpole succeeded in establishing a partial counterpoise. Sir Robert’s maiden speech was a failure: his manner was ungraceful, and he stammered for want of words. Another maiden speech, made the same evening, was a success; but Arthur Mainwaring is reported to have remarked: ‘You may applaud the one, and ridicule the other, as much as you please; but the spruce gentleman who made the set speech will never improve, while Mr. Walpole will, in time, become an excellent speaker.’ If this prophecy was only half fulfilled, it was a happier hit than the one hazarded on Pitt’s first appearance, ‘that Billy’s painted galley would go down before Charley’s black collier.’

Although St. John played the more conspicuous part in the violent proceedings of his first Session, the real leader of the

majority was Harley, who filled, at the same time, what would now be deemed the incompatible office of Speaker of the House of Commons. This man's character and career are utterly inexplicable upon any ordinary or consistent hypothesis. He managed a powerful party, which originally had every motive for distrusting him; he led the Queen blindfold for a season; he became an Earl, Knight of the Garter, and Prime Minister; he counted the haughty St. John amongst his followers, and the cynic Swift amongst his friends; yet we are required to believe that he had no one sterling quality of head or heart, and that his successes of all kind were exclusively owing to his plausibility, dissimulation, and hypocrisy. Both Lord Macaulay and Lord Stanhope speak of his rise as a social and political anomaly in this respect; and St. John substantially confirms their judgment, without satisfactorily explaining why the truth never broke upon him till the tenth or eleventh year of their alliance. Their only point of contact, independently of interest or ambition, was the bottle. Harley is described as constantly flustered with claret, and gave grave offence to the Queen by frequently appearing before her in that condition. But this weakness — from which the chief moralist of the age, Addison, was not exempt — deducted little from his reputed respectability; and decorous people shrugged their shoulders at his association with a profligate who made no scruple of aggravating licentious indulgence by profanity. At all events, it answered their common purpose to co-operate; and their contrasted habits gave them a double hold on the heterogeneous phalanx which they led. Whilst the grave and religious section relied on Harley, the gay and young were fascinated by St. John.

The self-seeking nature of their policy is betrayed by the manner in which they acquired power. It was by no means as uncompromising assertors of Tory or any other doctrines that they joined the Ministry in 1804. Godolphin and Marlborough, finding the war unpopular with the high Tories, were induced to make approaches towards the Whigs, which led to the retirement of the Tory Secretary of State (the Earl of Nottingham) and two other Tory officials. The vacant seals were given to Harley, and St. John was appointed Secretary at War. A question has been raised by the biographers whether he owed his appointment to Harley or Marlborough. Mr. Cooke thinks that he was carried forwards by Harley; whilst Mr. Macknight contends that Marlborough had an immediate interest in securing the Secretaryship of War for an adherent, and relies on one of St. John's letters as amounting to a specific

acknowledgement of the obligation. St. John, in a subsequent defence of his own conduct, denies that he was indebted to either of them, and appeals with reason to his parliamentary position as furnishing a sufficient reason for the choice. He certainly co-operated cordially with his illustrious military friend, paid the utmost deference to his wishes, and, in the official correspondence between them, used the terms best calculated to conciliate his favour, by exalting his services and elevating his fame. The Duchess of Marlborough endorsed on a letter of St. John that Godolphin said in his (the Duke's) presence that he never reproached himself so much with anything whilst he was in office under Queen Anne as in granting unreasonable sums of money to St. John, at the request of Marlborough; and there is extant a letter from him to Godolphin, from the camp at Mildert, which partially confirms the statement of his wife.

But the letter on which the charge mainly rests is a prior one, of November 1706, from the Secretary, in which he alludes to the intrigues of 'some restless spirits,' and appeals to the 'gratitude and duty' which have 'tied him for ever' to his Grace. If the writer of this letter was privy to the intrigues of Harley, and prepared to profit by them in due season, his baseness stands confessed. But there is no solid ground for supposing that he was so; and a well-considered view of his own interests would have kept him true, for Marlborough's star was still in the ascendant, and nearly a year afterwards we find Harley still amongst its worshippers. This consummate dissembler, who contrived to impose on such a master of Courtcraft as the Duke, was not likely to have made the reckless and indiscreet St. John privy to his immature and half-formed designs so long as he could do without him. These, however, spite of every precaution, became at length so notorious that the Lord Treasurer as well as the Commander-in-Chief refused to sit in council with him any longer; and on the 11th of February 1708 he resigned. St. John and Harcourt (the Attorney-General) resigned along with them, not strictly as friends or followers of Harley, but as finding their continuance in office incompatible with their Tory professions. The Godolphin Ministry, whilst it lasted, was thenceforth essentially, if not exclusively, Whig. That the change was not purely personal is proved by the appointment of Walpole, now the rising hope of the Whig party, to the Secretaryship of War; and the temporary predominance of the rival faction, rendering competition hopeless, was probably St. John's main motive in giving up his seat in the House of Commons, as well as his office, and

retiring into the country, to forswear ambition and devote himself heart and soul to literature and philosophy.

The chosen place of retirement was Bucklesbury, where St. John, whose love of books was genuine, turned his leisure to good account, looking up occasionally from the classic, historic, or philosophic page to indite a congratulatory epistle to Marlborough, or answer a confidential communication from Harley. 'And who are those,' writes Mrs. Freeman to Mrs. Morley, 'that you told me you had somewhere, but a few inconsiderable men, that have undertaken to carry Mrs. Masham up to a pitch of greatness from which she would be thrown down with infamy in a fortnight? What did some people in your service ride lately about from her to Mr. Harley at London, and thence to Mr. St. John's in the country, and then back again to her, and so again to London, as if they rid post all the while, but about some notable scheme, which, I dare swear, would make the world very merry if it were known?'

It will be remembered that, when the Duchess of Marlborough was in the height of her favour with Queen Anne, it was settled that all rules of etiquette implying inequality of station should be laid aside, and that the two friends should correspond as Mrs. Freeman and Mrs. Morley. The Duchess presumed upon the intimacy, grew imperious, became intolerable, and was eventually undermined by a suppler favourite of her own sex.

In Scribe's clever play, '*Un Verre d'Eau*,' the fate of ministries and the peace of Europe are made to turn on the event of a Court intrigue, in which the Duchess, and her poor relative and once humble dependant, Abigail Hill, contend for the favour of the Queen. Abigail conquers, the Godolphin administration is upset, and Marlborough is checked in his career of victory by a hastily-conceded peace. This plot is historically true in its main features; and the pettiness of the means and incidents by which the change was brought about is not exaggerated by the dramatist, although many of his details are of purely French manufacture on the face of them. Anne, like most dull women of rank, was fond of gossip and mystery; and from the moment she consented to be present at a private marriage between Abigail Hill and Masham, the struggle was practically at an end. The mistress of the robes was compelled to give way to the woman of the bedchamber; and her Grace's discomfiture involved that of the greatest general and the greatest statesmen of the age—of Marlborough, Godolphin, Walpole, and Somers. But it must not be supposed that the expulsion of the Whig leaders was entirely owing to female

temper or caprice. It would have been difficult to explode the mine unless they had prepared the train. The war had been prolonged unnecessarily, till the nation had grown tired of it; and the trial of Sacheverel was a political blunder of the first water. 'You had a sermon to condemn and a parson to roast—for that (writes St. John, addressing Walpole), I think, was the decent language of the time—but, to carry on the allegory, you roasted him at so fierce a fire that you burned yourselves.'

In her letters, and in the formal Apology for her conduct, the Duchess of Marlborough dwells with pleasure on the apprehensions with which she had inspired the Queen, and complacently enumerates the degrading shifts and devices to which Her Majesty was reduced in order to obtain private interviews with the servants in whom she trusted. The result was that the Queen compressed her anger till it fairly boiled over, and she connived with the plotters to make the dismissal of Godolphin as mortifying and compromising as she could. St. John and Harley are described as 'roaring with laughter' in Mrs. Masham's private apartments at the way in which the Queen made a dupe of Somers by intimating that she might possibly require his services to form an administration, and thereby prevented the Whigs from resigning in a body. When the final blow could be delayed no longer, the command to Godolphin to give up his treasurer's staff was brought him by a livery servant; a slight which so irritated him that he broke the staff contemptuously in the man's presence, and flung the pieces into the fire.

It would seem that the false hopes held out to some of the outgoing statesmen were not altogether insidious or ill-meant so far as Harley was concerned; for he intimated to the Lord Chancellor (Cowper) and Walpole that, if they would retain their places, St. John and Harcourt should only be admitted to the subordinate offices which they formerly held. Cowper and Walpole refused; a complete sweep was made of their party, and St. John (not over pleased at the delay) became Secretary of State. At that time there were two Secretaries of State; but his colleague, Lord Dartmouth, was of so little account, that St. John was universally regarded as *the* Secretary and the second of the two Ministers who were understood to be in fact the Government. Indeed, he could scarcely be called the second; for although Harley enjoyed the Queen's confidence and filled nominally the higher place, St. John managed the entire foreign relations of the country, and was the mainstay of the Ministry in the House of Commons.



Although he had written earnestly and eloquently on the stock of wisdom and virtue to be laid up in retirement, he returned to political and social life identically the same man, or rather with the self-same aspirations and appetites raised and sharpened by abstinence. He was once again at everything in the ring—wine, women, literature, philosophy, titles, wealth, power—eager as ever to assert the part of the modern Alcibiades, ‘to shine a Tully and a Wilmot too;’ or, as his friend Swift wrote:—

‘And yet some care of St. John should be had,  
Nothing so mean for which he can’t run mad;  
‘His wit confirms him but a slave the more.’

Mrs. Delany’s recollections, also, refer to this epoch:—

‘Mrs. Delany said *she* remembered Lord Bolingbroke’s person; that he was handsome, had a fine address, but he was a great drinker and swore terribly. She remembered his coming over to her uncle, Sir John Stanley’s, at Northend, his being very drunk, and going to the greenhouse, where he threw himself upon a couch: a message arrived to say he was waited for at the Council: he roused himself, snatched up his green bag of papers, and flew to business.’\*

The political position has been lucidly exposed by himself:—

‘I am afraid that we came to court in the same dispositions as all parties have done; that the principal spring of our actions was to have the government of the state in our hands; that our principal views were the conservation of this power, great employments to ourselves, and great opportunities of rewarding those who had helped to raise us, and of hurting those who stood in opposition to us. It is however true, that with these considerations of private and party interest there were others intermingled, which had for their object the public good of the nation, at least what we took to be such.’

Their paramount object was to withdraw from the war, which had entailed great sacrifices on England without corresponding advantages. To discredit the war policy, moreover, was to discredit Marlborough and the Whigs, and bar their return to power. It therefore became necessary to mould public opinion to their purposes through the instrumentality of the press. By a combination of circumstances which would form a good and ample subject for a treatise, pamphleteers and periodical writers had acquired, at the commencement of the eighteenth century, an extent of influence which no class of English journalists has enjoyed since. The only parallel for it is to be found in the

---

\* Miss Hamilton’s diary in Lady Llanover’s ‘Diary and Correspondence of Mrs. Delany,’ vol. vi. p. 168. Mrs. Delany remembered sitting when a child on Lord Bolingbroke’s knee at a puppet-show.

French press for a limited period before and after the Revolution of July. One obvious cause was the amount of varied talent engaged; including many names which are imperishably associated with our choicest literature. But what induced men like Swift, Addison, Steele, Prior, and De Foe, to lavish their genius on ephemeral objects, to give up to party what was meant for mankind? Leaving this problem for future solution, we will simply draw attention to the fact that quite as much was then thought to depend on the paper war as on the parliamentary, and that Swift's aid was deemed indispensable by statesmen who had the Queen and both Houses of Parliament at their beck. The price of his co-operation was unreserved intimacy and confidence. He was accordingly humoured, wheedled, and flattered to the top of his bent by both St. John and Harley. All their hopes, wishes, designs, projects, and measures were made known to him; and the '*Journal to Stella*,' in which everything that passed between him and his great friends is familiarly set down, forms consequently one of the most remarkable aids to history that exists in any language.

His estimate of St. John was very high from the commencement of their acquaintance, and grew higher with time.

Thus, November 11, 1710:—

'I am thinking what a veneration we used to have for Sir William Temple, because he might have been Secretary of State at fifty; and here is a young fellow, hardly thirty, in that employment. His father is a man of pleasure, that walks the Mall, and frequents St. James's Coffee-house, and the chocolate-houses, and the young son is principal Secretary of State. Is there not something very odd in that?'

A year later, November 3, 1711:—

'Yes, I think Mr. St. John the greatest young man I ever knew; wit, capacity, beauty, quickness of apprehension, good learning, and an excellent taste; the best orator in the House of Commons, admirable conversation, good nature, and good manners; generous, and a despiser of money. His only fault is talking to his friends in way of complaint of too great a load of business, which looks a little like affectation; and he endeavours too much to mix the fine gentleman, and man of pleasure, with the man of business.'

Swift's peculiar humour was sometimes indulged in a way which in any other man would be regarded as ludicrous affectation or vulgarity:—

'I dined to-day with Mr. Secretary St. John: I went to the Court of Requests at noon, and sent Mr. Harley into the House to call the Secretary, to let him know I would not dine with him if he dined

late. By good luck the Duke of Argyle was at the lobby of the House too, and I kept him in talk till the Secretary came out.'

The Dean delighted in trifling, and it may be thought that St. John would have proved a more congenial companion than Harley. But the contrary was the case:—

'Tis (let me see) three years and more,  
October next it will be four,  
Since Harley bid me first attend,  
And chose me for an humble friend;  
Would take me in his coach to chat,  
And question me of this and that,  
Or gravely try to read the lines  
Writ underneath the country signs.'

Warton relates that another of their amusements in these excursions consisted in counting the poultry on the road, and which ever reached thirty-one first, or saw a cat, or an old woman, won the game. Bolingbroke overtaking them one day in their road to Windsor, got into Oxford's coach, and began some political conversation. Oxford said, 'Swift, I am up; there is a cat!' Bolingbroke was disgusted with this levity, and went again into his own carriage.

The first duty imposed on Swift was to undertake the chief conduct of a weekly paper, the 'Examiner;' his contributions to which, from November 1710 to June 1711, fill an octavo volume of his works. The first twelve papers were written by Atterbury, Prior, Frend, St. John, and other persons of note. One, which went by the name of Mr. St. John's Letter to the 'Examiner,' attracted great attention—greater, we agree with Scott, than its intrinsic merits warranted—and provoked an able reply from Lord Cowper. Its principal topic was the impolicy of the war. The argument was effectively followed up by Swift, in his 'Conduct of the Allies;' and at length the Ministry were emboldened to open these negotiations with France which ended in the famous Peace of Utrecht. This peace was too imperatively demanded by the position of the Ministry to be conducted with becoming consideration for the complicated interests at stake. The most important steps were taken with suspicious secrecy; and our Allies were studiously kept in the dark concerning them, till it was too late to dissent or protest. St. John's order to the Duke of Ormond, the English commander in the Netherlands, not to engage in any active operation, may be taken as a sample; his Grace being instructed to keep this order a secret from the allied general, Prince Eugene. The postscript, resembling the proverbial one to a woman's letter, contains this startling announcement, which it is difficult to

distinguish from an overt act of treason, no suspension of arms having yet been settled: 'I had almost forgotten to tell your Grace that communication is given of this order to the Court of France.' Whatever the Secretary's faults and weaknesses, he was not the man to shrink from personal responsibility, for no council was held upon this communication, and the majority of his colleagues, including the Premier, were kept in ignorance of it.

Whilst these negotiations were pending, many important events occurred bearing upon the fortunes of St. John. The abortive attempt of Guiscard gave Harley so marked an accession of favour and popularity as to rouse the jealousy of St. John, who tried hard to inculcate a belief, not altogether devoid of foundation, that the assassin's stab was really intended for himself. Advantage was taken of the adventure to create Harley Earl of Oxford and Mortimer; and St. John, left undisputed leader of the Commons, was now at the culminating point of his career, at the very acme of prosperity, if he could have been induced to think so. It was about this time that he originated the club, of which we read so much in the 'Journal to Stella.' Writing to Lord Orrery, he says:—

'The first regulation proposed, and that which must be most inviolably kept, is decency. None of the extravagance of the Kit Cat, none of the drunkenness of the Beefsteak, is] to be endured. The improvement of friendship and the encouragement of letters are to be the two great ends of our society.'

Oxford and his friends were members, and the two rivals, as they must henceforth be deemed, also met on friendly terms at what Swift calls his best night-house, Lady Masham's, where the coterie consisted of the Mashams, St. John, Oxford, Arbuthnot, and Mrs. Hill of the bedchamber, sister of Lady Masham. We catch frequent glimpses of St. John's domestic life in the 'Journal to Stella':—

April 7, 1711:—

'I called this evening to see Mr. Secretary, who had been very ill with the gravel and pain in his back, by burgundy and champagne, added to the sitting up all night at business; I found him drinking tea, while the rest were at champagne, and was very glad of it. I have chid him so severely, that I hardly knew whether he would take it well: then I went and sat an hour with Mrs. St. John, who is growing a great favourite of mine; she goes to the Bath on Wednesday, for she is much out of health, and has begged me to take care of the Secretary.'

August 4 and 5, 1711:—

'I dined yesterday at Buckleberry (*sic*), where we lay two nights, and

set out this morning at eight, and were here at twelve; in four hours we went twenty-six miles. Mr. Secretary was a perfect country gentleman at Buckleberry; he smoked tobacco with one or two neighbours; he inquired after the wheat in such a field; he went to visit his hounds, and knew all their names; he and his lady saw me to my chamber just in the country fashion. His house is in the midst of near three thousand pounds a year he had by his lady, who is descended from Jack Newbury, of whom books and ballads are written; and there is an old picture of him in the house. She is a great favourite of mine.'

In the ensuing Session, beginning December 1711, the Ministry were rudely shaken, an important vote having been carried against them in the Lords. Although they were only beaten by a majority of one, their alarm was extreme; for much more than their places was at stake. Whenever any of them rose to speak, Lord Wharton put his hands to his neck by way of intimating that the speaker was risking his head. The Queen was thought to have given them up; and Swift begged to be sent abroad, telling Oxford, half in earnest, that his Lordship would have the worst of it, insomuch as he would lose his head, whilst he (Swift) should simply be hanged and be buried entire. This was the occasion when the Ministers resorted to the strong measure of creating twelve new peers in a batch. On their taking their seats, Lord Wharton asked if they meant to vote by their foreman. St. John, who was waiting in the Court of Requests to learn the result of the first division in which their votes were counted, on hearing that the result had answered his expectations, exclaimed, 'If these twelve had not been enough, we would have given them another dozen.' In exile he spoke of the measure as 'unprecedented and invidious, to be excused by nothing but the necessity, and hardly by that.'

It is said that he wished to be removed to the Upper House as one of this batch, and reluctantly consented to the postponement of his claim. The House of Lords was then the most important assembly, except when the nation was peculiarly excited; and the peerage carried with it a degree of personal weight and consequence which we can hardly picture to ourselves in these days.\* Yet St. John's position in the House of Commons was of a nature to satisfy the most soaring ambition.

---

\* No gentleman (says Lord Macaulay, writing of 1691) who had had a dispute with a nobleman could think without indignation of the advantages enjoyed by the 'favoured caste.' In 'Humphry Clinker' Lord Ossington treats a challenge from Mr. Bramble, a commoner of ancient descent, as an act of presumption and an impertinence. 'What, a commoner send a challenge to a peer of the realm! Privi-

In the 'Journal to Stella,' Feb. 23, 1712, we find —

'The Secretary is much the greatest commoner in England, and turns the whole Parliament, who can do nothing without him; and if he lives and has his health, will, I believe, be one day at the head of affairs. I have told him sometimes, that, if I were a dozen years younger, I would cultivate his favour, and trust my fortune with his. But what care you for all this?'

The readiness with which the Queen had agreed to the creation of peers, having convinced the Trimmers that no immediate change in that quarter was to be anticipated, the Ministry were emboldened to follow up their victory by wreaking vengeance on their discomfited assailants. There was no thought or talk of generosity. *Væ victis* was the word. Walpole was voted guilty of notorious corruption, committed to the Tower, expelled the House, and declared incapable of sitting in any future parliament. Resolutions were passed strongly reflecting on Marlborough for receiving sundry perquisites as Commander-in-Chief in Flanders; Cardonnel, the Duke's secretary, was expelled for corruption; and Lord Townshend was voted an enemy of his country. Any show of opposition was haughtily repressed, and words were resented as disloyal or seditious, which in less excited times would have been regarded as idle effusions of spleen or discontent. When Hampden, the lineal descendant of the patriot, ventured to complain of the sluggishness of the campaign, and the delay of the negotiations, saying: 'We are amused by our Ministers at home, and tricked by our enemies abroad,' St. John retorted with acrimony, 'I have too great a share in the management of affairs not to resent such insinuations. They reflect highly on Her Majesty and Her Majesty's Ministers. Members have been committed to the Tower for less offences: but though the honourable gentleman may be desirous of that honour, the House may be of another opinion.'

No Minister, since the days of the Star Chamber, had persecuted the press with equal violence. Writing to the Queen, Oct. 17, 1711, he says: 'I have discovered the author of another scandalous libel who will be in custody this afternoon; he will make the thirteenth I have seized, and the fifteenth I have found out.' Swift, who was more than any writer exposed to reprisals, resorts without scruple to a secretary's warrant when hard pressed in controversy. Oct. 16, 1711:—

---

'I beg! Privilege! Here's a person brings me a challenge from the Welshman that dined at my table. An impudent fellow! My wine is not yet out of his head.'

'One Boyer, a French dog, has abused me in a pamphlet, and I have got him up in a messenger's hands: the Secretary promises me to swinge him. Lord-Treasurer told me last night, that he had the honour to be abused with me in a pamphlet. I must make that rogue an example, for warning to others.'

The only semblance of an excuse is to be found in the all-pervading spirit of party, which is amusingly illustrated by the periodical writers and essayists. Thus Swift, in 'The Examiner,' No. 31, writes:—

'The Whig ladies put on their patches in a different manner from the Tories. They have made schisms in the playhouses, and each have their particular sides at the opera; and, when a man changes his party, he must infallibly count upon the loss of his mistress. I asked a gentleman the other day how he liked such a lady; but he would not give me his opinion till I had answered him whether she were a Whig or a Tory.'

The same subject is admirably treated in the 'Spectator' (No. 81.), by Addison, who states, by way of illustration, that in a draught of marriage articles a lady had stipulated with her husband that, whatever his opinions are, she shall be at liberty to patch on which side she pleases: that a famous Whig partisan had most unfortunately a beautiful mole on the Tory part of her forehead, which had given a handle to her enemies to misrepresent her face as though it had revolted to the Whig interest; and that an equally famous Tory was unfortunate in a pimple, which forced her against her inclinations to patch on the Whig side.

The hostility of faction found an appropriate field of display in the first representation of Addison's play of 'Cato.' The event is succinctly narrated by Johnson:—

'The whole nation was at that time on fire with faction. The Whigs applauded every line in which liberty was mentioned as a satire on the Tories; and the Tories echoed every clap to show that the satire was unfelt. The story of Bolingbroke is well known. He called Booth to his box and gave him fifty guineas for defending the cause of liberty so well against a perpetual dictator. The Whigs, says Pope, design a second present when they can accompany it with as good a sentence.'

The year before this occurrence St. John had become Viscount Bolingbroke, a promotion which he eagerly solicited, although there is a passage in his Letter to Windham hinting that it was forced upon him. He could not bear to see Oxford exalted so far over his head, and fully expected to take his place alongside him as an earl, the earldom of Bolingbroke having been formerly held by a branch of his family. As some solace to his wounded pride, he was charged with a special mission to Paris for the

purpose of accelerating the negotiations, and his reception there was such as is commonly given to national heroes or deliverers. The French editor of his letters says that 'he was received as 'an angel of heaven. Whenever he entered the theatre the 'spectators rose to mark their respect.' His stay in the French capital was short—little more than a week—but long enough to create a highly favourable impression of his manners and address, as well as to lay the foundation of two or three scandals which have never been cleared up. Thus Mr. Macknight unhesitatingly accepts and amplifies the story of his alleged *liaison* with Madame de Tencin, known to history by various profligate intrigues, personal and political, in concert with her brother, the Abbé de Tencin, as well as by giving birth to an illegitimate child, who, unluckily for her fame, lived to be a very celebrated man. She was the reputed mother of D'Alembert, who was found by a glazier's wife on the steps of a church one cold November morning and brought up by her. Coxe, on the authority of Horace Walpole, states that Madame de Tencin coaxed some valuable secrets out of Bolingbroke and stole some of his papers. But he was no novice; and profligate as the lady and her brother may have been, the Abbé afterwards became a cardinal, whilst she held and retained a distinguished position amongst those 'women of brilliant talents 'who violated all the duties of life, and gave very pleasant 'little suppers.' There was nothing at all remarkable, therefore, in Bolingbroke's intimacy with them; and we agree with Mr. Wingrove Cooke that the honour of inventing the rest of the story may, without much danger, be divided between the Parisians and Horace Walpole.

Another scandal of a much more serious kind was that Bolingbroke had secretly communicated with the Pretender; but the sole foundation for it seems to be, that they were once at the same opera, which was not denied by Bolingbroke or his friends. 'He protested to me (writes Swift to Archbishop 'King), that he never saw him but once, and that was at a great 'distance in public, at the opera.' To suppose that Bolingbroke, the observed of all observers, would have chosen such a place for an interview, is preposterous. Besides, he had no fixed Jacobite views at that time, and no known motive for seeking an interview with the Pretender, during his French mission. That he formed relations abroad of a nature to excite jealousy, is clear from Oxford's 'Brief Account;' and soon after his return, the official correspondence with France was taken from him and transferred to Lord Dartmouth, to the serious detriment of the negotiations and the confusion of Prior, who,



left as a kind of plenipotentiary in Paris, exclaims, 'I have 'neither powers, commission, title, instructions, appointments, 'or secretary.' The want of all had been supplied by the unreserved confidence with which he was treated by the Secretary. They address each other as Mat and Harry, and on such unrestrained terms that the editor of the correspondence has thought fit to suppress some passages on the score of propriety.

The Peace of Utrecht was signed April 11, 1713, and might fairly have been expected to strengthen the Ministry. But the nation was not long in discovering that neither its honours nor its interests had been consulted so much as the pressing wants of the negotiators. Bolingbroke admits that the terms were not such as the Allies were entitled to insist upon; and his abandonment of the Catalans, in particular, has caused his memory to be perpetuated among that gallant people much as that of Castlereagh is perpetuated among the Genoese. In his formal Vindication he tries hard to throw the principal blame of the ensuing disappointment on Oxford:—

'Instead of gathering strength, either as a ministry or as a party, we grew weaker every day. The peace had been judged with reason to be the only solid foundation<sup>a</sup> whereupon we could erect a Tory system: and yet when it was made we found ourselves at a full stand. Nay the very work, which ought to have been the basis of our strength, was in part demolished before our eyes, and we were stoned with the ruins of it. Whilst this was doing, Oxford looked on, as if he had not been a party to all which had passed; broke now and then a jest, which savoured of the inns of court and the bad company in which he had been bred: and on those occasions, where his station obliged him to speak of business, was absolutely unintelligible.'

He goes on to show that he was obliged to undermine Oxford, to prevent Oxford from undermining him. It was diamond cut diamond; and Oxford, who had risen through Mrs. (now Lady) Masham, like the engineer hoisted by his own petard, was summarily flung down by her. He had balked her hope of pecuniary gain on two occasions: so she told the Lord Treasurer to his face, 'You have never done the Queen 'any service, nor are you capable of doing her any.'

Whilst the crisis was preparing, Bolingbroke pursued his ordinary course of life, mixing relaxation with business, and gallantry with politics. A letter to the Earl of Strafford, dated Ashdown Park, October 8, 1713, begins: 'Tired as I am with 'foxhunting, since the messenger is to return immediately to 'London, I cannot neglect,' &c. One to the Duc d'Aumont, the French ambassador, is dated '*De mon Ecurie, ce 21<sup>me</sup> Octobre,*

'1713,' and begins, '*Parmi les chiens et les chevaux, au milieu de la plus profonde retraite.*' On December 1713, writing to Sir John Stanley, he excuses the delay of General Evans in setting out for his command on the plea that 'Young Hawley, his Lieutenant-colonel, had the misfortune to break his bones in fox-hunting with me.' When Prior announces that M. de Torcy has promised to sit for his picture, Bolingbroke (Sept. 29.) replies: 'Assure him, dear Matt, that I will place it among the Jennys and the Mollys, and that I will prefer it to all of them. . . For God's sake, Matthew, say half a score pretty things to Madame de Torcy and Madame de Noailles, and father them upon me. I have really in my life done as much for several friends, that shall be nameless.' He had despatched a cargo of honey-water, sack, and Barbadoes-water to be distributed between his fair friends at Paris, and Prior, Oct. 6, 1713, writes:—

'I am now upon the greatest piece of negotiation that I ever had in my life, the distribution of your cargo: upon which the Noailles and the Croissys are in an uproar, but having wherewithal to appease them, I begin the great work this afternoon, and shall give you a full account of my actions by the next: both at Fontainebleau and Croissy, we have all remembered *le cher Henri* in the friendliest manner imaginable; and on my side, I have and will continue to lie most strenuously for you.'

'Adieu, my dear Lord; if at my return I may help you any way in your drudgery, the youngest clerk you have is not more at your command; and if at the old hour of midnight, after your drudgery, a cold blade-bone of mutton, in Duke Street, will go down *sicut olim*, it, with all that belongs to the master of the house (except Nanny), is entirely yours.'

Swift accuses Bolingbroke of affectation in talking of the load of affairs flung upon him; but the printed correspondence proves their variety and multiplicity. With half continental Europe on his hands, he was obliged to undertake the virtual guidance of the Irish Viceroyalty; a task far from facilitated by the high and independent character of the Lord Lieutenant, the Duke of Shrewsbury, whom he tried to conciliate by flattery:—

'It belongs only to those of your Grace's standard, not to let slip the minutest affairs, while they roll in their minds the fate of kingdoms, and the government of the world.'

Bolingbroke was also obliged to be in assiduous attendance on Lady Masham and the Queen. He had calculated on passing the Christmas of 1713 with them undisturbed by the presence of Oxford; but on arriving at Windsor, he found the

Queen alarmingly ill, and during the whole of the ensuing month, the public mind was in a state of feverish apprehension of her death. Steele seized the occasion for the publication of his famous pamphlet, 'The Crisis,' one of the poorest of his political productions; yet its reception was such as to excite the envy of Swift, who answered it in 'The Public Spirit of the Whigs.' It is a curious feature of the period that both these eminent writers were prosecuted for these productions respectively with the most unrelenting hostility. Steele was expelled the House of Commons for his share in the controversy, and Swift was with difficulty rescued by Oxford (who protested in his place as a Peer of the realm that he knew nothing of the pamphlet) from the vengeance of the Lords, at whose instigation a reward of 300*l.* was offered for the discovery of the author. The crisis was indeed imminent; for although the Queen's recovery was officially notified prior to the opening of the new Parliament, she was not expected to outlive the year, and a counter-revolution was obviously on the cards. How far Oxford and Bolingbroke, one or both, aimed or laboured at it, has been vehemently and laboriously discussed. Whether, like Godolphin and Marlborough, they were in communication with the exiled family, is hardly worth disputing; but specific plans and overt acts are much more serious things, and we see no reason to distrust Bolingbroke when he says, 'As to what might happen afterwards, on the death of the Queen, to speak truly, none of us had any settled resolution.' Or, again: 'One side was united in a common view, and acted upon a uniform plan; the other had really none at all.'

He was disposed to run greater risks than Oxford, and greater expectations were based upon his adhesion to the Jacobite cause; for the Duke of Berwick expressly states in his Memoirs, that the Pretender's friends were directed to throw all their influence into the scale against the Lord Treasurer. Had Queen Anne lived long enough for Bolingbroke to get firm hold of the reins, their speculation might have answered. As things turned out, it is clear that he was taken by surprise; and the violence with which he acted against the friends of the Protestant Succession, especially in his support of the Schism Act, may be explained by his wish to outshine Oxford in the eyes of the more intolerant and bigoted of the Tories, the noisy and obstreperous members of the October Club. He will not receive credit for having been hurried on by the strength of his convictions, by his devotion to the Church Establishment or hereditary right; and, to do him justice, he affected no enthusiasm of the sort. Whilst

many doubted whether he was a believer in Providence, he was a waiter on it; and he failed from causes which no human policy could have controlled.

In an article attributed to the late Lord Macaulay which appeared in this Journal in October, 1835 (Ed. Rev. vol. lxii. p. 1.), we took occasion to discuss the evidence of the complicity of Bolingbroke as well as Oxford in the plot for the restoration of the Pretender, from the correspondence of the Abbé Gaultier in the Mackintosh papers. These papers have since been more fully examined by M. Grimblot, who published the results of his investigation in the '*Revue Nouvelle.*' M. Grimblot's opinion is considerably less unfavourable to Bolingbroke than that of Lord Macaulay. Iberville's report of his first conversation with Lord Bolingbroke on the 28th December, 1713, proves how little the English Minister was disposed to commit himself, and that he was convinced that nothing could be done for the Chevalier as long as he remained a Roman Catholic. But whatever may have been the extent of Bolingbroke's incomplete negotiations with the Jacobites, there is no doubt of the subtlety and passion with which he sought to overthrow his former ally, Harley.

'The Dragon (Oxford) holds fast with a dead grasp the little 'machine' (the Treasurer's staff), wrote Arbuthnot to Swift, in the height of the struggle. He held it so fast that the effort to wrest it from him wore out and broke down his adversary. The Council in which he was dismissed presented one of the most extraordinary scenes ever acted on any stage. He gave vent to a burst of impotent rage, reviled Lady Masham, and vowed vengeance on the male and female authors of his disgrace. When he left the room, the choice of the Commissioners by whom he was to be replaced was anxiously discussed, and the sitting lasted till two in the morning. The Queen remained till the close; but the agitation was too much for her; she withdrew, exclaiming that she had received her death-blow, and was carried to her bed, from which she never rose again. This Council was held on Tuesday, July 27th. On the morning of Friday, the 30th, she was struck speechless by a fit of apoplexy. The Council hastily re-assembled; and Bolingbroke, who attended it as Prime Minister expectant, left it a baffled intriguer, with utter ruin staring him in the face. On a hint of what was likely to happen from Shrewsbury, the Dukes of Somerset and Argyll, who were not of the Cabinet or governing Junta and had not been summoned, took their places at the Board, moved (they said) by the grave nature of the emergency. They proposed that the physicians should be examined; and, learning

that the Queen's consciousness was returned, Argyll moved and carried an address, requesting her to deliver the Treasurer's staff to Shrewsbury. She gave it to him, telling him to use it for the good of her people. On the next day but one (August 1st) she died. 'The Earl of Oxford was removed on Tuesday : the Queen died on Sunday. What a world is this! and how does Fortune banter us!' So wrote Bolingbroke to Swift, two days after the catastrophe. A dashing attempt to reverse the current of events was proposed by Atterbury, who offered to go in his lawn-sleeves with a troop of Life Guards, and proclaim James III. at Charing Cross. But, far from concurring in the scheme, Bolingbroke attended the proclamation of King George at the Guildhall, and was well received by the populace, who hooted Oxford.

Strange to say, both Oxford and Bolingbroke entertained hopes of a favourable reception from the new sovereign; and Oxford, who foolishly intruded himself on the royal presence, at Greenwich, was received (as recorded by his rival) 'with the most undisguised contempt.' Bolingbroke underwent the mortification of receiving no answer to a letter which he had addressed in his capacity of Minister to George I., and about a fortnight after the accession he was formally dismissed.\* His papers were sealed up, a pretty clear intimation of what he had to expect; and, as he afterwards owned, 'he could expect no quarter from the Whigs, for he deserved none.' Yet instead of taking measures of precaution, or meditating flight, he retired into the country, where he spent the winter receiving all the solace he was capable of deriving from his hounds and horses, his farmyard, his neighbours, and his wife, who, with true womanly feeling, had merged all her own wrongs and sufferings in sympathy for *his*. The calm was superficial and shortlived. A pamphlet, written by De Foe at Oxford's instigation, artfully suggested that the ex-Treasurer had been dismissed by Queen Anne for counteracting the Jacobite designs of the ex-Secretary. A proclamation from the Pretender confirmed the general belief in those designs; and the new

---

\* In a very curious Diary kept by Lady Cowper (wife of the Chancellor Earl Cowper) from 1714 to 1720 (both inclusive), about to be published under the editorship of the Honourable Spencer Cowper, it is said : 'At the coronation, my Lord Bolingbroke for the first time saw the King. He had attempted it before without success. The King, seeing a face he did not know, asked his name when he did him homage, and he (Lord B.) hearing it, as he went down the steps of the throne, turned round and bowed three times down to the very ground.'

elections had gone so much in favour of the Whigs as to free them from restraint, and frustrate all attempts to make head against them. The addresses in both Houses were ominous and menacing.

'It was clear, then (says Mr. Macknight), that a prosecution was impending over both Oxford and Bolingbroke. Oxford conducted himself with his characteristic caution. He came from the country to town, and went back from town to the country several times in a mysterious, uncertain way, speaking little, and that little quite unintelligible, seldom appearing in public, and never putting himself prominently forward in opposition. Bolingbroke assumed quite a bold and defiant air. His speech on the first day of the session was almost a challenge to his opponents; he showed himself everywhere; spoke confidently of his innocence; and seemed as though he cared nothing for what his enemies might do. This was, however, all acting. He was at heart much more alarmed than Oxford. After showing himself at the theatre, on the evening of the 25th of March, complimenting the actors, and bespeaking a play for the next night, he suddenly, with all the ready money he could raise on his property, left town in the disguise of a valet to the French messenger, La Vigne, who was just going over to Paris. He wrote from Dover a letter to his friend, George Granville, then Lord Lansdowne, and was then conveyed quietly over to Calais.'

The purport of the letter was, that his flight had been hurried by sure information that his blood was to be 'the cement of a new alliance;' and the warning, despite of his subsequent denial, was supposed to have come from Marlborough. Another motive alleged by him for refusing to abide a trial was, that he must have made common cause with Oxford. 'A sense of honour would not have permitted me to distinguish his case and mine own, and it was worse than death to lie under the necessity of making them the same, and of taking measures in concert with him.' This would have been foolish had it been true; and it was clearly untrue; for their cases were essentially distinct, and were carefully kept distinct by Oxford and his friends. The distinction between them, indeed, is the best excuse that can be made for Bolingbroke's conduct in flying from the danger which was confronted by his hated partner in persecution. There is another statement in his Letter to Windham which cannot be reconciled with the facts. He tries to make out that he joined the Pretender in consequence of a representation that he would serve his Jacobite friends in England by so doing, and when the 'smart of a bill of attainder tingled in every vein.' It may be true that, on arriving at Paris, he promised Lord Stair, the English ambassador, to keep free of

Jacobite engagements; but one of the first persons he saw on arriving there was the Duke of Berwick, with whom he at once established an understanding; and a letter of his to James, dated the 23rd July, proves that he was doing duty as Jacobite Secretary of State some weeks before he was impeached at the bar of the House of Lords. The bill of attainder was passed in September.

A well-chosen selection from the correspondence which he conducted in this new capacity has been printed by Lord Stanhope (Mahon) in the appendix to the first volume of his History; and we should infer from it that Bolingbroke acted throughout with zeal, ability, and good faith. Such was not the Pretender's opinion, nor that of his confidential advisers, especially the priests and Irishmen, who were jealous of Bolingbroke, and felt rebuked by his superiority. Soon after James's return from his abortive expedition to Scotland, in February, 1716, Bolingbroke was summarily and insultingly dismissed, the principal of the alleged grounds being that he had omitted the proper means of procuring men and money from France. In reference to this charge, Berwick says, in his 'Memoirs':—

'As I have been partly witness of what Bolingbroke did for — (the Pretender), whilst he had the direction of his affairs, I owe him the justice to declare that he omitted nothing that was in his power to do. He stirred heaven and earth to obtain success, but the Court of France did nothing but amuse him.'

One of their modes of amusing him was to throw Madame de Tencin in his way, who, according to Mr. Macknight, was still a divinity in his eyes. She was so much the contrary that in the letter to James of August 15th, he says:—

'I have been in commerce with a woman for some time who has as much ambition and cunning as any woman I ever knew—perhaps as any man. Since my return to Paris, she has, under pretence of personal concern for me, frequently endeavoured to sound how far I was engaged in your service, and whether any enterprise was on foot.'

This is not the language of a lover deifying his mistress; and after stating the use that might be made of her 'private but strict commerce' with the Duke of Orleans, he concludes with self-sacrificing loyalty:—

'Your Majesty will excuse this detail, if you judge it impertinent, and you will give me your orders if you think any use may be made of such an intrigue. *I would have even the pleasures of my life subservient to your Majesty's service, as the labours of it shall be always.*

Bolingbroke was now at the lowest depth of his fortunes. Of the two great parties between which his countrymen were divided, the one calumniated and reviled him; the other did worse, they laughed at or pitied him. Lord Stair writes from Paris to Horace Walpole, March 3, 1716:—

‘And so poor Harry is turned out from being Secretary of State, and the seals are given to Mar; and they use poor Harry most unmercifully, and call him knave, and traitor, and God knows what. I believe all poor Harry’s fault was that he could not play his part with a grave enough face: he could not help laughing now and then at such kings and queens. He had a mistress here at Paris; and got drunk now and then; and he spent the money upon his mistress that he should have bought powder with, and neglected buying and sending the powder and arms, and never went near the Queen; and in one word told Lord Stair all their designs, and was had out of England for that purpose. I would not have you laugh, Mr. Walpole, for all this is very serious.’

‘May my arm rot off if I ever use my sword or my pen in their service again,’ was his very natural exclamation on receiving a conciliatory message from Mary of Modena. He lost no time in taking steps to make his peace with the English Government, and hopes were held out to him through Lord Stair of a speedy reversal of his attainder. But although the King was favourably disposed, it was found impossible to overcome the well-founded resentment of the Whigs, and he was doomed for many a long year to feel the sickening pang of hope deferred in all its bitterness. It was about this time (1716-1718), that he sought relief in the composition of ‘Reflections on Exile,’ in which he rings the changes on those very maxims of pseudo-philosophy which were most at variance with his own state of mind. The reflection of Brutus that exiles could not be prevented from carrying their own virtue along with him, was ludicrous in the mouth of one who had no virtue to carry; and although, when the Grecian sage was asked where his country was situated, he pointed to the heavens, the English recluse would have found a closer parallel in the Frenchman, who, when asked at the extremity of Europe where a road led, replied that it led to the Palais Royal. The country on which Bolingbroke’s thoughts were fixed was the House of Lords and the King’s closet.

The Letter to Windham, also composed (or principally so) in 1717, is a production of a very different order. It is a masterly review of his conduct from the formation of the Harley Ministry in 1710. Mr. Wingrove Cooke speaks of the publicity immediately obtained by this letter, in contradistinction to the



formal and posthumous publication in 1753. Mr. Macknight insists that it obtained no immediate publicity, and doubts whether it was ever sent to Sir William Windham at all. It would require more space than we can afford to go into this question, or into several other questions of literary and political interest raised by these biographies.

Bolingbroke's first wife died in November, 1718, two years after the commencement of his intimacy with the lady, the Marquise de Villette, who became his second in May, 1720. He had a rival in Macdonald, a Scotch Jacobite, who, one day at dinner at the lady's, exasperated his jealousy to such a pitch that he started up with the view of inflicting personal chastisement. Unluckily, or luckily, his foot slipped, he tumbled against the table, upset it, and fell upon the floor amongst the plates and dishes. Grimoard, who records the incident in his '*Essai Historique*,' states that Bolingbroke's gallantries were not diminished either by his love for this lady or his marriage. But he failed to rouse her jealousy by recounting them, or by dwelling, as was his wont, on his amatory exploits. 'Ah,' was her remark, 'as I look at you, methinks I see the ruins of a fine old Roman aqueduct, but the water has ceased to flow.' She was a widow, two years older than himself. A difficulty arose after the marriage relating to a portion of her fortune intrusted to Sir Matthew Decker, who refused to pay it, on the ground of its coming within the attainder. To obtain the indemnity which he insisted upon, she came over to England by her husband's wish, and, failing with the Ministers, induced the King's mistress, the Duchess of Kendal, by a bribe of 11,000*l.*, to procure an Act to free Bolingbroke from all penalties and disabilities, so far as holding property or residing in England was concerned. This was in 1725. He had received a pardon under the Great Seal in 1723. Further the Ministers, under her and the King's direct instigation, refused to go; their supporters, they urged, were unmanageable; but it cannot be supposed that Walpole and Townshend really wished to reinstate Bolingbroke in a position where he could become a candidate for power. He afterwards asserted that the death of George I. was nearly as fatal to his political prospects as that of Anne; and Horace Walpole is at some pains to discredit the rumour that his father was in danger of being displaced to make room for his enemy. The Duchess of Kendal, it seems, secretly delivered a memorial from Bolingbroke requesting an interview. The King handed it over to Walpole, who recommended his royal master to grant the request. The interview took place; and when the Minister inquired the

purport of the promised communication, the King exclaimed with a laugh, '*Bagatelles, Bagatelles.*'

By speculating in the famous Mississippi scheme, Bolingbroke made money enough to purchase a house and small estate called *La Source*, near Orléans; a spot which his temporary residence has made classical. He was here visited by Voltaire, who wrote to Teriot:—

'Il faut que je vous fasse part de l'enchantement où je suis du voyage que j'ai fait à *La Source*, chez Milord Bolingbroke et chez Madame de Villéte. J'ai trouvé dans cet illustre Anglais toute l'érudition de son pays et toute la politesse du nôtre.'

But the place which, through him, became richest in literary associations, was Dawley, near Uxbridge, which he purchased of Lord Tankerville about 1726. It was here that Pope, Gay, and Swift were his guests. His mode of life may be collected from their correspondence. In a letter dated Dawley, June 28th, 1728, Pope writes to Swift:—

'I now hold the pen for my Lord Bolingbroke, who is reading your letter between two haycocks, but his attention is somewhat diverted by casting his eyes on the clouds, not in admiration of what you say, but for fear of a shower. . . . As to the return of his health and vigour, were you here you might inquire of his haymakers; but, as to his temperance, I can answer that (for one whole day) we have had nothing for dinner but mutton broth, beans and bacon, and a barn-door fowl. Now his lordship is run after his cart, I have a moment left to myself to tell you that I overheard him yesterday agree with a painter for 200*l.* to paint his country hall with trophies of ricks, spades, prongs, &c., and other ornaments, merely to countenance his calling this place a farm.'

Bolingbroke anxious for his hay, may be paralleled by Fox in the Louvre considering whether the weather was favourable for his turnips at St. Ann's Hill. Dawley was a handsome country-house, with park, gardens, stables, fancy farm, &c., and cost him, sooner or later, 23,000*l.* 'I never (writes Swift) 'knew him live so grandly and expensively as he has done 'since his return from exile. Such mortals have resources 'that others are not able to comprehend.'

On his being thrown in fox-hunting, Pope writes to Swift: 'Lord B. had not the least harm by his fall. I wish he had 'received no more by his other fall.' He also occupied a large house in Pall Mall, with the view of watching or taking part in the political game, from which he never could hold aloof long, although pretty sure to rise a loser. Hatred of Walpole had become his ruling passion; and the features of his arch-foe may be traced in most of his historical portraits of bad ministers.

including those of Richard II. and Charles I. He was eternally racking his invention for new modes of attack and new forms of invective; yet, somehow or other, his weapons did so much harm on the recoil, or when they were flung back, that more than once he was requested by his own side to hold his hand and absent himself. His devious career had laid him terribly open to telling retorts; and, eloquent as were his printed diatribes, his friends were not always able to bear up against the pitiless storm of obloquy which they provoked. A remarkable example occurred in 1735, in a debate on the Septennial Bill, when Sir William Windham (Bolingbroke's Parliamentary double), having drawn a fancy picture of a corrupt minister, meaning Walpole, was answered in his own strain:—

‘But now, Sir, let me too suppose, and the House being cleared, I am sure no person that hears me can come within the description of the person I am to suppose. Let us suppose, in this or in some other unfortunate country, an anti-minister who thinks himself a person of so great and extensive parts, and of so many eminent qualifications, that he looks upon himself as the only person in the kingdom capable to conduct the public affairs of the nation, and therefore christening every other gentleman who has the honour to be employed in the administration by the name of blunderer. Suppose this fine gentleman lucky enough to have gained over to his party some persons really of fine parts, of ancient families and of great fortunes, and others of desperate views arising from disappointed and malicious hearts; all these gentlemen, with respect to their political behaviour, moved by him and by him solely—all they say, either in private or public, being only a repetition of the words he has put into their mouths; and a spitting out that venom which he has infused into them; and yet we may suppose this leader not really liked by any even of those who so blindly follow him, and hated by all the rest of mankind.’

‘Let us further suppose this anti-minister to have travelled, and at every court where he was thinking himself the greatest minister, and making it his trade to betray the secrets of every master he has ever served. I could carry my suppositions a great deal further, and I may say I mean no person now in being; but if we can suppose such a one, can there be imagined a greater disgrace to human nature than such a wretch as this?’

There is a good deal more of the same pungent quality; and turning round to the Opposition, Walpole asked them how they liked the picture. Bolingbroke put a bold face on the matter, but left England soon afterwards; and in a letter to Windham, July 23, 1739, we find: ‘I hear he (Pulteney) has talked of something he expects from me; but I desire he may be told

'I will write nothing. He thought my very name and presence in England did hurt.'

Three pamphlets of his, under the title of 'The Occasional Writer,' gave rise to a sharp controversy. Walpole, ever ready for the encounter with tongue or pen, wrote most of the answer, concluding with this advice: 'Your retirement is pleasant; enjoy it. The public is ungrateful; patronise it no more. Build, plant, read, drink, sport, pun, or make solemn engagements; do anything but protect us, and we are safe.' Bolingbroke's principal organ was 'The Craftsman,' a weekly paper, established under the auspices of Pulteney and other leaders of the Opposition, in December, 1725. His contributions extend over a period of eight or ten years, and are easily distinguishable. His 'Letters on the History of England,' under the signature of Humphrey Oldcastle, originally appeared in this paper; as did his 'Dissertation on Parties.' To each of these publications in its collected shape was prefixed a Dedication to Walpole, in which all the author's powers of irony and satire were put forth. In 1736 he published an 'Essay on the Spirit of Patriotism,' in the form of a letter to Lord Cornbury; and after his retirement to France, a letter to Lord Bathurst on 'The True Use of Retirement and Study.' His 'Letters on History' (also addressed to Lord Cornbury) were first printed for private circulation; and a copy having been lent by Pope to Warburton, elicited a criticism from the divine which gave lasting offence to the author. The 'Idea of a Patriot King' was composed in 1739 with especial reference to Frederick Prince of Wales; the moral being that a patriot prince should begin by emancipating himself from the control of party, i. e. of Walpole and the Whigs. It is full of pregnant and pointed sentences, which have not yet lost their weight or applicability. In one of his moments of expansion with a British statesman, Napoleon III. lamented that, under his *régime*, by a lamentable necessity, all that France had learnt of representative institutions or self-government might be lost. This very result of despotism was anticipated by Bolingbroke: 'Old men will outlive the shame of losing liberty; and young men will arise who know not that it ever existed.' It is the mark of genius to say things which are both particular and general,—which serve the purpose of the hour, and survive it.

The 'Patriot King' is said to have been the text-book of George III., whom it strengthened in his mischievous obstinacy when holding out against the recognition of American Independence and Catholic Emancipation. A very disagreeable discovery led to the publication of this work. Pope had been

intrusted with the manuscript, in order to get five or six copies printed for private circulation. On his death, the printer wrote to say that 1500 copies had been printed and kept in reserve for the poet, who had, moreover, taken the liberty of altering and suppressing passages. Bolingbroke, more irritated, probably, by the liberty taken with his composition than by the fraud, burnt the whole 1500 on the terrace of his house at Battersea, himself setting fire to the heap; and afterwards (1749) published the essay, with a Preface, commenting severely and (it was thought) ungenerously on Pope. But we reserve for a future opportunity what we may have to say touching their literary and personal relations, which exercised the most momentous influence on the genius and reputation of the poet. We may also safely throw aside the philosophical speculations, on which Bolingbroke confidently relied for obtaining the highest niche in the temple of Fame. Their character and posthumous publication have been made notorious by Dr. Johnson's memorable sentence:—'Sir, he was 'a scoundrel and a coward: a scoundrel for charging a blunder-buss against religion and morality — a coward because he had 'not resolution to fire it off himself, but left half-a-crown to a 'beggary Scotchman (Mallet) to draw the trigger after his 'death.' The freedom and boldness of sundry comments on religious subjects, printed by Bolingbroke in his lifetime — in his 'Letters on History,' for example — repel the charge of cowardice; and when Burney afterwards asked the sturdy moralist if he had seen Warburton's book against Bolingbroke's philosophy, he replied, 'No, Sir; I have never read 'Bolingbroke's impiety, and therefore am not interested about 'its confutation.' It hardly required confutation, being self-contradictory as well as shallow; and the blunderbuss, ever since its first loud and innocuous discharge, has been laid on the shelf, like a clumsy and obsolete weapon in a curiosity shop.

It was Bolingbroke's unhappy destiny to survive his second wife and most of his circle of admiring friends, whose places the new generation were little anxious to supply. He grew angry and bitter at not receiving from Pitt the same deference he was wont to receive from Windham. He died, after much suffering, of cancer in the face, on the 12th of December, 1751; having taken leave of Lord Chesterfield a few days before his death, saying, 'God, who placed me here, will do what He 'pleases with me hereafter, and He knows best what to do. 'May He bless you.'

Assuming 'great' to be a term for expressing the extent of influence, good or bad, that has been exercised by an individual

on thought and action, or the space he has occupied in men's minds, a plausible claim to it may be advanced for Bolingbroke, who falls little short of the received standard. He was pre-eminently gifted with the qualities that lead mankind captive. He was *facile princeps* in the senate, the council-chamber, and the saloon. He maintained the same ascendancy amongst statesmen, orators, courtiers, fine gentlemen, and wits. His name may be tracked in history by a luminous streak, such as a shooting-star leaves behind it in its glancing and glittering dash across the sky. He swayed the course of events to and fro in the crisis of a nation's destiny: he organised and breathed life into parties: he set up and pulled down governments: he elevated and depressed dynasties. Not a scrap or relic of his speeches has been preserved; yet the tradition of their excellence is as sure in its way as that of Chatham's action (in the Demosthenic sense), of Sheridan's first Begum speech, of Garrick's dramatic art, or of many other stock objects of admiration which no one dreams of questioning. Nay, it is much surer; for, as already intimated, the same combination of thoughts, words, and images — the same *vis viva* — by which (delivery apart) Bolingbroke swayed assemblies, are found in his writings; and these are the very qualities which still constitute their principal attraction.

Oddly enough, it is his happiest imitator, Burke, who is made to ask, 'Who now reads Bolingbroke?' The answer is, that few read him for his political opinions which are out of date, for his principles which may prove unsound, or for his statements which are often one-sided; but all lovers of English literature read him as one of the masters of our tongue; and to students of rhetoric he is, or ought to be, a text-book. The highest living authority on this point, Lord Brougham, declares that 'if Bolingbroke spoke as he wrote, he must have been the 'greatest of modern orators, so far as composition goes,' having already pronounced his assemblage of purely personal qualifications — face, figure, voice, presence, manner — to be unequalled. Boldness, rapidity, vigour, lucid clearness of expression betokening perfect precision of thought and correct rhythmical sentences constructed of short Saxon words, are amongst his charms; but what is absolutely inimitable is his imagery, which is as rich and varied as Dryden's, and more chaste. We are tempted to give one more example:—

'It is evident that a Minister, in every circumstance of life, stands in as much need of us public writers as we of him; in his prosperity he can no more subsist without daily praise, than we without daily bread; and the farther he extends his views, the more necessary are

we to his support. Let him speak as contemptuously of us as he pleases, for that is frequently the manner of those, who employ us most, and pay us best; yet will it fare with his ambition as with a lofty tree, which cannot shoot its branches into the clouds, unless its root work into the dirt, from which it rose, on which it stands, and by which it is nourished.'

We, of course, limit our highest praise to his best works, such as the 'Letters on History,' the 'Dissertation on Parties,' the 'Letter to Windham,' or the 'Idea of a Patriot King,' of which Lord Chesterfield says, "'Till I read that work, I confess I did not know all the extent and powers of the English language.' Either of these might have helped to console Pitt, who (as the current story goes), when the company were speculating on what lost or missing production was most to be regretted, and one was naming the lost books of Livy, and another those of Tacitus, at once declared for 'a speech of Bolingbroke.'

The moral of his career lies upon the surface for those who run to read. It is, that honesty is emphatically the best policy: that the most splendid talents, without prudence, principle, religion, or morality, are as nought. In theory, his grand object was his country—in practice, it was himself; his sentiments were uniformly noble, his conduct was frequently mean; his passions always got the better of his resolutions, or (as one of his friends told him in early youth), whilst his soul was all virtue, his body was all vice. A Stoic in the library, he was an Epicurean at the supper-table and in the boudoir. Innumerable writers have tried their hands at him, analysing, sifting, comparing, balancing, and counter-balancing his merits and defects; yet all of them bring us back to the crowning reflection of a congenial and sympathising spirit, Lord Chesterfield: 'Upon the whole of this extraordinary character, where good and ill were perpetually jostling each other, what can we say but alas! poor human nature!'

- ART. V. — 1. *Lectures on Jurisprudence; being the Sequel to 'The Province of Jurisprudence Determined.'* To which are added Notes and Fragments, now first published from the Original Manuscripts. By the late JOHN AUSTIN, Esq., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Two vols. 8vo. London: 1863.
2. *On the Uses of the Study of Jurisprudence.* By the late JOHN AUSTIN, Esq., of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Reprinted from the Third Volume of 'Lectures on Jurisprudence.' London: 1863.

THESE Lectures and Fragments, with the volume on 'The Province of Jurisprudence,' of which they are the continuation, and a very few though very elaborate essays on miscellaneous subjects, published at long intervals, mostly in Reviews, are all that remains of the intellectual life of a most remarkable mind. Mr. Austin's name and writings are little known, except to students of the science which, though only of those on which his writings prove him to have reflected, was the subject on which he principally wrote. But in that science, even the limited portion of his labours which was before the world had placed him, in the estimation of all competent judges, in the very highest rank; and if such judges are now greatly more numerous than when he began to write, the fact is in no small degree owing to his intellectual influence. He has been in nothing more useful than in forming the minds by which he is, and will hereafter be, judged. No writer whom we know had more of the qualities needed for initiating and disciplining other minds in the difficult art of precise thought. Though the merit and worth of his writings as a contribution to the philosophy of jurisprudence are conspicuous, their educational value, as a training school for the higher class of intellects, will be found, we think, to be still greater. Considered in that aspect, there is not extant any other book which can do for the thinker exactly what this does. Independently of the demands which its subject makes upon the attention, not merely of a particular profession, but of all liberal and cultivated minds, we do not hesitate to say that as a mere organon for certain faculties of the intellect, a practical logic for some of the higher departments of thought, these volumes have a claim to a place in the education of statesmen, publicists, and students of the human mind.

It is not, of course, intended to claim for Mr. Austin a position in the philosophy of law either equal or similar to that



which posterity will assign to his great predecessor, Bentham. That illustrious thinker has done, for this important department of human affairs, what can only be done once. But though the work which Mr. Austin did, neither would nor could have been done if Bentham had not given the impulse and pointed out the way, it was of a different character from Bentham's work, and not less indispensable. In the confidence of private friendship, Mr. Austin once said of himself, that if he had any special intellectual vocation, it was that of 'untying knots.' In this judgment he estimated his own qualifications very correctly. The untying of intellectual knots; the clearing up of the puzzles arising from complex combinations of ideas confusedly apprehended, and not analysed into their elements; the building up of definite conceptions where only indefinite ones existed, and where the current phrases disguised and perpetuated the indefiniteness; the disentangling of the classifications and distinctions grounded on differences in things themselves, from those arising out of the mere accidents of their history, and, when disentangled, applying the distinctions (often for the first time) clearly, consistently, and uniformly—these were, of the many admirable characteristics of Mr. Austin's work as a jurist, those which most especially distinguished him. This untying of knots was not particularly characteristic of Bentham. He cut them rather. He preferred to draw his pen through the whole of the past, and begin anew at the beginning. Neither his tastes nor his mental habits were adapted to the other kind of work: but, though his neglect of it led him not unfrequently into errors, yet, all things considered, success ~~was~~ justified his choice. His effect on the world has been greater, and therefore more beneficial, by means of it. The battering ram was of more importance, in Bentham's time, than the builder's trowel. He had to conquer an inveterate superstition. He found an inconceivable mass of barbarian conceits, obsolete technicalities, and contrivances which had lost their meaning, bound together by sophistical ingenuity into a semblance of legal science, and held up triumphantly to the admiration and applause of mankind. The urgent thing for Bentham was to assault and demolish this castle of unreason, and to try if a foundation could not be laid for a rational science of law by direct consideration of the facts of human life. To rescue from among the ruins such valuable materials as had been built in among rubbish, and give them the new and workmanlike shape which fitted them for a better edifice; to hunt among the irrationalities of law for helps to its rationale, was work for which, even if it had been opportune in his day, Bentham had not time. For Bentham's subject

had a wider range than Mr. Austin's. It was the whole, of which the latter is but a part. The one inquiry was ultimate, the other instrumental. Mr. Austin's subject was Jurisprudence, Bentham's was Legislation.

The purpose of Bentham was to investigate principles from which to decide what laws ought to exist—what legal rights and legal duties or obligations are fit to be established among mankind. This was also the ultimate end of Mr. Austin's speculations; but the subject of his special labours was theoretically distinct, though subsidiary, and practically indispensable, to the former. It was what may be called the logic of law, as distinguished from its morality or expediency. Its purpose was that of clearing up and defining the notions which the human mind is compelled to form, and the distinctions which it is necessitated to make, by the mere existence of a body of law of any kind, or of a body of law taking cognisance of the concerns of a civilised and complicated state of society. A clear and firm possession of these notions and distinctions is as important to practice as it is to science. For only by means of it can the legislator know how to give effect to his own ideas and his own purposes. Without it, however capable the legislator might be of conceiving good laws in the abstract, he could not possibly so word them, and so combine and arrange them, that they should really do the work intended and expected.

These notions and distinctions form the science of jurisprudence as Mr. Austin conceived it. The readers of what we must now call his first volume, 'The Province of Jurisprudence Determined,' have probably often regretted, that though it discussed in a most elaborate and searching manner the 'province' (in other words the subject-matter and limits) of jurisprudence, the nature and uses of the study itself were rather taken for granted than expressly set forth. This, which was a real defect in the former volume, considered as a separate work, is now supplied by a dissertation on the study of jurisprudence, formed out of the introductory lectures to the two courses which Mr. Austin delivered, at University College and at the Inner Temple. This instructive paper, besides being included in the larger work, has, in order to recommend the study to a more numerous body of readers, been judiciously published separately as a pamphlet.

We have already, in reviewing\* the second edition of Mr. Austin's 'Province of Jurisprudence,' republished by his widow in 1861, compared and contrasted the method of Mr. Austin with

---

\* Ed. Rev. vol. cxiv. p. 474.

that of another eminent philosophical lawyer, Mr. Maine. The subject-matter of both writers is positive law—the legal institutions which exist, or have existed, among mankind, considered as actual facts. The aim of both is to let in the light of philosophy on these facts; and both do this with great success. Neither writer treats *ex professo* of laws as they ought to be; though, in treating of them as they are and as they have been, it is the declared aim of both to facilitate their improvement. But they pursue this end for the most part through different intellectual media. Mr. Maine's operation is essentially historical; not only in the mode of prosecuting his inquiry, but in the nature of the inquiry itself. He investigates, not properly the philosophy of law, but the philosophy of the history of law. In the various legal institutions which obtain, or have formerly obtained, he studies principally the causes that produced them. His book may be called a treatise on the action and reaction between the ideas prevalent among mankind, and their positive institutions. Under each of the principal classes of facts with which law is conversant—family, property, contract, and delict or offence—he historically investigates the primitive ideas of mankind, traces the customs and institutions which have prevailed ever since to their origin in those primitive ideas, and shows how institutions which were modelled on the rude notions of an early state of society, have influenced the thoughts of subsequent generations down to the present time. Speculations like these, when directed, as Mr. Maine's are, by a true historical genius, possess in a preeminent degree all the uses which can belong to history. The laws and institutions of primitive mankind are the richest indications available for reading their thoughts, entering into their feelings, and understanding their general mode of existence. But the historical value of these studies is the smallest part of their utility. They teach us the highly practical lesson, that institutions which, with more or less of modification, still exist, originated in ideas now universally exploded; and conversely, that ideas and modes of thought which have not lost their hold even on our own time, are often the artificial, and in some sort accidental product of laws and institutions which exist no longer, and of which no one would now approve the revival.

It is not in this manner, except incidentally and occasionally, that Mr. Austin's treatise contributes to the improvement of law; though there is a place allotted to such speculations in his comprehensive conception of the study of jurisprudence. He does not specially contemplate legal systems in reference to their origin, and to the psychological causes of their existence. He considers them in respect of what may be called their

organic structure. Every body of law has certain points of agreement with every other; and between those which have prevailed in cultivated and civilised societies, there is a still greater number of features in common. Independently of the resemblances which naturally exist in their substantive provisions (designed as these are for the same world, and for the same human nature), there is also a certain common groundwork of general conceptions or notions, each in itself very wide, and some of them very complex, which can be traced through every body of law, and are the same in all. These conceptions are not preexistent; they are a result of abstraction, and emerge as soon as the attempt is made to look at any body of laws as a whole, or to compare one part of it with another, or to regard persons, and the facts of life, from a legal point of view. There are certain combinations of facts and of ideas which every system of law must recognise, and certain modes of regarding facts which every such system requires. The proof is, that all legal systems require a variety of names, which are not in use for any other purpose. Whoever has apprehended the full meaning of these names—that is, whoever perfectly understands the facts and the combinations of thoughts which they denote—is a master of juristical knowledge; and a well-made lexicon of the legal terms of all systems would be a complete science of jurisprudence: for the objects, whether natural or artificial, with which law has to do, must be the same objects which it also has occasion to name.

But to conceive distinctly a great mass of objects, partly resembling and partly differing from one another, they must be classed; and to make any set of practical provisions, which cover a large field, definite and intelligible, they must be presented to the mind on some principle of arrangement, grounded on the degree of their connexion and alliance with one another. The details of different legal systems are different, but there is no reason why the main classifications and heads of arrangement should not be in a great measure the same. The facts of which law takes cognisance, though far from being identical in all civilised societies, are sufficiently analogous to enable them to be arranged in the same *cadres*. The more general of the terms employed for legal purposes might stand for the same ideas, and be expounded by the same definitions, in systems otherwise different. The same terminology, nomenclature, and principle of arrangement, which would render one system of law definite, clear, and (in Bentham's language) cognoscible, would serve, with additions and variations in minor details, to render the same office for another.

Such a result, however, has not been attained by the mode in which existing bodies of law have been formed. Laws having in general been made singly, and their mass having grown by mere aggregation, there has usually been no authoritative arrangement but the chronological one; and no uniform or predetermined phraseology, even in the case of statute law; while in many countries, and preeminently in England, the greater portion of the law, the part which serves as the basis for all the rest, does not exist at all in the form of general language, but lies imbedded in judicial decisions; of which even the general principle has to be evolved by abstraction, and made the subject of forensic disputation, when the time comes for applying it. Whatever definiteness in detail, and whatever order or consistency as a whole, has been attained by any established system, has in almost all countries been given by private writers on law. All the generalisations of legal ideas, and all explicit statements of the meaning of the principal legal terms, have, speaking generally, been the work of these unauthorised persons — have passed from their writings into professional usage, and have ended by being, either expressly, or oftener by implication, adopted by governments and legislatures. So far as any great body of law has been systematised, this is the mode in which the work has been done; and being done piecemeal, by persons often ill-prepared for the task, and who had seldom any other object in view than the convenience of professional practice, it has been, as a general rule, done very ill. Instead of classing objects together which agree in their main features, or in the points which are of chief importance to the ends of law, the classes formed consist of things which have either no common qualities, or none but such as are common to them with other things. When the bond of connexion is real, it seldom lies in the things themselves, but usually in the historical accidents of the particular body of laws. In actual systems of law ‘most of the leading terms’ (it is truly said by Mr. Austin\*) ‘are not names of a definite class of objects, but ‘of a heap of heterogeneous objects.’

The only mode of correcting this evil, is to free from confusion and set in a clear light those necessary resemblances and differences, which, if not brought into distinct apprehension by all systems of law, are latent in all, and do not depend on the accidental history of any. These resemblances and differences, while they are the key to all others, are evidently those which, in a scientific point of view, are alone worth understanding in them-

---

\* *Province of Jurisprudence*, p. 14.

selves. They are also those which are alone fit to be made use of as the groundwork of a scientific arrangement. The fact that they exist in all legal systems, proves that they go deeper down into the roots of law than any of those which are peculiar to some one system. That the main divisions of the subject should be grounded on these, follows from the first principle of classification, that the general should take precedence of the special: and as they are common to all systems, or to all which are of any scientific importance, the parts of any given system which are peculiar to it will still find, in this arrangement, a proper place in which to lodge themselves; which would not happen if the main arrangement were itself grounded on distinctions purely historical, and belonging only to a particular system.

To clear up these general notions is, therefore, the direct object of the science of jurisprudence, as conceived by Mr. Austin. And the practical result of the science, if carried to the greatest perfection of which it is susceptible, would be to provide, first, such a legal terminology (with a strict and precise meaning attached to every word and phrase) that any system whatever of law might be expressed in it; and next, such a general scheme of arrangement, that any system whatever of law might be distributed according to it; and that when so expressed and distributed, every part of it would be distinctly intelligible, and each part would assist the comprehension of all the rest. Jurisprudence, thus understood, is not so much a science of law, as of the application of logic to law. But by affording a clear and connected view of the whole field of law—illuminating it by large, comprehensive, and exactly discriminated conceptions—and enabling every legal part to be classed at once with those with which it has the nearest alliance, it bestows on the student either of the philosophy of law, or of any existing legal system, a command over the subject such as no other course of study would have made attainable.

In the attempt to investigate, and bring out into scientific clearness, the conceptions and distinctions of general jurisprudence, Mr. Austin has built chiefly on the foundation of the Roman law. This has been a cause of disappointment to some earnest students, who expected, and would have preferred, something more decidedly original. The course, however, which Mr. Austin deliberately adopted, admits, we conceive, of full justification. If the conceptions and distinctions which he sought belong to law in general, they must exist in all bodies of law, either explicitly or latently, and might, in strictness, be evolved from any. By stripping off what belongs to the accidental or historical peculiarities of the given system, the elements which

are universal will be more surely and completely arrived at, than by any process of construction *à priori*; and with the additional advantage of a knowledge not confined to generals, but including under each generalisation a large acquaintance with the concrete particulars contained in it. If this be so, the legal system which has been moulded into the shape it possesses by the greatest number of exact and logical minds, will necessarily be the best adapted for the purpose; for, though the elements sought exist in all systems, this is the one in which the greatest number of them are likely to have been brought out into distinct expression, and the fewest to remain latent. And this superiority is possessed, beyond question, by the Roman law. The eminent systematising genius of the Roman jurists, and not any over-estimate of the Roman law considered in itself, determined Mr. Austin to make it the basis of his own investigations; as is evident from many passages, and from the following especially:—

‘ Much has been talked of the philosophy of the Roman Institutional writers. Of familiarity with Grecian philosophy there are few traces in their writings, and the little that they have borrowed from that source is the veriest foolishness: for example, their account of *Jus Naturale*, in which they confound Law with animal instincts—Law, with all those wants and necessities of mankind which are causes of its institutions.

‘ Nor is the Roman law to be resorted to as a magazine of legislative wisdom. The great Roman Lawyers are, in truth, expositors of a positive or technical system. Not Lord Coke himself is, more purely technical. Their real merits lie in their thorough mastery of that system; in their command of its principles; in the readiness with which they recall, and the facility and certainty with which they apply them.

‘ In consequence of this mastery of principles, of their perfect consistency (*elegantia*), and of the clearness of the method in which they are arranged, there is no positive system of law which it is so easy to seize as a whole. The smallness of its volume tends to the same end.

‘ The principles themselves, many of them being derived from barbarous ages, are indeed ill fitted to the ends of law, and the conclusions at which they arrive being logical consequences of their imperfect principles, necessarily partake of the same defect.’ (*Study of Jurisprudence*, pp. 17–19.\*)

---

\* In the outline of his Course of Lectures, prefixed to ‘The Province of Jurisprudence,’ Mr. Austin seems to rest the logical superiority of the Roman over the English legal system mainly on the absence of the darkening distinction between real and personal property—a distinction which has no foundation in the philosophy of law, but solely in its history, and which he emphatically characterises

Mr. Austin, therefore, was justified in seeking for the constituent elements of universal jurisprudence where they were certain to be found, and where (from the superior quality of the minds which had been employed on the system) more of those elements had been explicitly recognised, and adopted into the scientific arrangement of the law itself, than in any other legal system. There remains, it is true, a question belonging to a later stage of the inquiry: did the Roman jurists select as the foundation of their technology and arrangement those among the conceptions and distinctions of law universal which were best fitted for the purpose? Mr. Austin seems to think that they did; since his own arrangement is merely theirs in an improved form. We shall presently give our reasons for thinking that, with great merits, the arrangement of the Roman jurists has great faults; that, in taking as the ground of their entire system the classification of rights, they adopted a principle suited only to what Bentham called the substantive law, and only to the civil branch of that, and, in so doing, reversed the order of filiation of juristical conceptions, and missed the true aim of scientific classification. But this, though a very important, is still a secondary consideration. To find the absolutely best systematic order for a body of law, would be the ultimate result of a complete science of jurisprudence; but its main

---

as 'a cause of complexness, disorder, and darkness, which nothing but the extirpation of the distinction can thoroughly cure.' (P. xciv.) The following passage (vol. ii. pp. 153-4.) shows at once his opinion of the English law, considered as a system, and of the reasons for preferring the Roman law to it, as a guide to general jurisprudence:—

'I will venture to affirm that no other body of law, obtaining in a civilised community, has so little of consistency and symmetry as our own. Hence its enormous bulk, and (what is infinitely worse than its mere bulk) the utter impossibility of conceiving it with distinctness and precision. If you would know the English law, you must know all the details which make up the mass. For it has none of those large *coherent* principles which are a sure *index* to details; and, since details are infinite, it is manifest that no man (let his industry be what it may) can compass the whole system.'

'Consequently, the knowledge of an English lawyer is nothing but a beggarly account of scraps and fragments. His memory may be stored with numerous particulars, but of the law as a whole, and of the mutual relations of its parts, he has not a conception.'

'Compare the best of our English treatises with the writings of the classical jurists, and of the modern civilians, and you will instantly admit that there is no exaggeration in what I have ventured to state.'



problem is to give clearness, precision, and consistency to the juristical conceptions themselves. What Mr. Austin has done towards this object, constitutes the great permanent worth of his speculations, considered as substantive results of thought. No one thoroughly versed in these volumes need ever again miss his way amidst the obscurity and confusion of legal language. He will not only have been made sensible of the absence of meaning in many of the phrases and dogmas of writers on law, but will have been put in the way to detect the true meaning, for which those phrases are the empty substitute. He will have seen this done for him in the Lectures, with rare completeness, in regard to a great number of the leading ideas of jurisprudence; and will have served an apprenticeship, enabling him with comparative ease to practise the same operation upon the remainder.

The Course of Lectures, which occupies the greatest part of these volumes, was never completed. The first eleven lectures, condensed (or rather enlarged) into six, form the original volume, lately republished. The remainder have never before appeared in print, but left an indelible impression on the minds of those who heard them delivered, among whom were an unusual number of persons since distinguished as among the foremost minds of the time. Though the Lectures do not conclude the subject, yet, with the loose and unfinished but rich and suggestive memoranda which have been very properly subjoined to them, they fill up the greatest part of the outline given in the first volume; so that, when taken in conjunction with that outline, and with the important and elaborate notes appended to the tables which Mr. Austin prepared of the various known arrangements of the field of law, they give something like an adequate idea of the mode in which he would have treated the entire subject. We may add that, notwithstanding the fragmentary nature of the latter part of these volumes, they will be found, on the whole, easier reading (if that epithet can be applied to anything worth reading on such a subject) than the work already so highly prized by those for whom it was intended. This is an effect of that peculiarity of Mr. Austin's mind, which made his first drafts always more fitted for popularity than his finished performances. For in deliberate scientific exposition he was so rigid in his demands on himself, so intolerant of anything short of absolute completeness, so impatient while the slightest shadow rested upon any part of the field he surveyed, that he was apt to overlay his work with excess of matter, and by the elaboration which he

bestowed on minor points, weakened the general effect of his elucidation of those which were greater. But this, while it necessarily diminished the popularity of his writings, added to their intrinsic value. Where most men would have permitted themselves to pass lightly over some detail or difficulty, he developed it at full length; but it was because he well knew that unless the point were cleared up, the matter in hand could not be understood thoroughly. Those who pass on their way leaving dark corners unexplored, and concern themselves only with as much of the subject as lies straight before them, often through that neglect miss the very key of the position. Absence of light and shade, and uniformity of distance, bringing all objects alike into the foreground, are fatal defects in describing things for merely artistic purposes; but Mr. Austin's delineations are like geometrical line-drawing, not intended to exhibit objects in their most impressive aspect, but to show exactly what they are. Whether it would have been possible, by greater artifice of composition, to have somewhat relieved the tension of mind required by the length and intricacy of the fifth and sixth chapters of '*The Province of Jurisprudence*;' whether somewhat more of rhetoric, in the elevated sense in which the word was understood by Aristotle, might have conciliated an easier reception for their severe logic—those who have best learnt from experience the extreme difficulty of such a task will be the most backward to decide. But we feel certain that any competent student of the subject who reads those chapters once, will read them repeatedly, and that each reading will raise higher his estimate of their substance, and reconcile him more, if he ever needed reconciliation, with their manner.

In the very summary view which can alone be taken of the contents of the work, a few words must be premised on the introductory portion, although reviewed only two years ago in our own pages; the rather, as it affords an apt exemplification of what we have said concerning the object and character of the entire treatise. The inquiry into the '*Province of Jurisprudence*' may be correctly characterised as being from one end to the other an analysis and explanation of a word. It is an examination of what is meant by a law, in the political or juristical sense of the term. And yet it is as far from being a merely verbal discussion, as the inquiry into the meaning of justice, which is the foundation of the greatest and most renowned of the writings of Plato. For the meaning of a name must always be sought in the distinctive qualities of the thing named; and these are only to be detected by an accurate study

of the thing itself, and of every other thing from which it requires to be distinguished.

A law is a command. A command is an expression of desire, issuing from a superior, and enforced by a sanction, that is, by something of the nature of a punishment. Law, however, does not mean every command, but only commands which oblige *generally*—which oblige to acts or forbearances of a class, not to *an* act or forbearance individually determined. These several notions having been duly analysed and illustrated, various objects are brought to view, which do not possess all the attributes of a law, but which, bearing a certain analogy to laws, require to be distinguished from them. And even within the limits of the strict meaning of the term, the laws which are the subject of jurisprudence require to be distinguished from laws in the same logical sense but of a different species—namely, divine laws, or the laws of God. The region which these different inquiries travel over is large and important, including the following as its principal parts:—

First, the laws of God. Of the six lectures, or chapters, composing the volume, three are occupied in the inquiry, by what means the will of God, concerning the rules of conduct to be observed by his rational creatures, is to be ascertained—ascertained, that is, so far as it has not been revealed, or, if revealed, requires ulterior inquiry respecting the sense intended by the revelation. The author discusses at considerable length the two rival theories on this subject, that of utility, and that of the moral sense; of the former of which he is an earnest supporter, and has given a most able and instructive defence. His treatment is sometimes such as might suggest the idea that he regarded the binding force of the morals of utility as depending altogether upon the express or implied commands of God. This, however, is a mere appearance, arising from the particular point of view to which he was limited by the nature of his subject. What is called the moral law, was only related to the Law of which Mr. Austin was treating, in so far as it might be considered to possess the distinctive character of laws proper, that of being the command of a superior. If he could have been suspected of encouraging a mere worship of power, by representing the distinction of right and wrong as constituted by the Divine will, instead of merely recognised and sanctioned by it, the supposition would have been conclusively rebutted by a passage at page 116.: ‘If the laws set by the Deity were not generally ‘useful, or if they did not promote the general happiness of his ‘creatures, or if their great Author were not wise and benevo-

‘lent, they would not be good, or worthy of praise, but were  
‘devilish and worthy of execration.’

The laws with which jurisprudence is conversant, having been distinguished from divine laws, have next to be discriminated from what are called laws only by way of analogy—rules prescribed and sanctioned only by opinion: to which Mr. Austin, by a happy extension of the term Positive as applied to law, gives the name of Positive Morality, meaning the moral opinions and sentiments actually prevailing in any given society, as distinguished from Deontology, or morality as it ought to be. Of this character is much that is commonly (to the great confusion of the minds of students) called by the name of Law. What is termed Constitutional Law is in part only maxims of morality, considered proper to be observed towards one another by the component members of the sovereign body. But the strongest case is that of International Law, which, as independent nations are not subject to any common political superior, ought not to be termed Law, but Positive International Morality. It is law only in as far as effect is given to its maxims by the tribunals of any particular country; and in that capacity it is not international law, but a part of the particular law of that country.

Lastly, laws properly so called have to be distinguished from laws which are such only in a metaphorical sense—the laws of nature, as the expression is understood by physical inquirers, meaning the uniformities of co-existence or succession in the phenomena of the universe. That an ambiguity like this should ever have misled anyone—that what are laws only by a metaphor, should be supposed to be laws in the same sense as those which are really the commands of a superior—would hardly *à priori* have appeared probable; yet this confusion is total in the majority of modern writers, among whom Mr. Austin mentions Hooker, Blackstone, and Montesquieu in his celebrated first chapter, which is even now regarded by most French thinkers as profound philosophy. In our own country, we are frequently warned by a certain class of writers against disobeying or violating the physical laws of organic life, as if it were not the very meaning of a physical law that it may be unknown or disregarded, but cannot possibly be violated.

These distinctions, with the many important considerations into which they branch out, bring us to the end of the fifth chapter. The sixth is employed in giving precision to the remainder of the conceptions involved in a law in the positive sense (a law emanating from a sovereign or political superior), by clearing up the meaning of sovereignty, and independent

political society: involving incidentally the whole subject of constitutional organisation, and the division of the sovereignty among several members; also that of subordinate governments, of federations, and all the various relations in which one political society can stand to another.

In the Lectures newly published, the first subject treated is the most general of all those which come within the scope of jurisprudence—the nature and meaning of Rights (understanding thereby legal rights), and of legal Duties or Obligations. In order to treat of this subject, it was necessary to define certain notions, which are involved in all cases of rights and duties—the notions of person, thing, act, and forbearance. These, accordingly, are the first matters with which the author deals; and he criticises various cases of confusion of thought or misuse of language on these subjects, in the writings of jurists.

All rights, as he observes, are rights to acts or forbearances, either on the part of persons generally or of particular persons. When we talk of our right to a thing, we mean, if the thing is in our possession, a right to the forbearance of all persons from taking it, or disturbing us in its enjoyment. If it is in the possession of some other person, we mean a right to an act or forbearance of that person—the act of delivering it to us, or forbearance on his part from detaining it. It is by commanding these acts and forbearances that the law confers the right; and the right, therefore, is essentially and directly a right to them, and only indirectly to the thing itself.

Right is correlative with legal duty or obligation. But though every right supposes a correlative obligation—though the obligation properly constitutes the right—every obligation does not create a right correlative to it. There are duties or obligations which are not relative, but (as the phrase is) absolute. The act commanded is not to be done, or the forbearance observed, towards or in respect to a determinate person; or, if any, not a person distinct from the agent himself. Such absolute duties comprise, first, what are called duties towards oneself. The law may forbid suicide or drunkenness; but it would not be said, by so doing, to give me a right to my life or health as against myself. Secondly, duties towards persons indefinitely, or towards the sovereign or state; such as the political duties of a citizen, which do not correspond to any right vested in determinate individuals. Lastly, duties which do not regard persons—the duty, for instance, of abstaining from cruelty to the lower animals; and religious duties, as such, if the law, most improperly, thinks fit to enforce them.

From a comparison between duties which correspond to rights, and duties which have no corresponding rights, and also from a brief review of the different kinds of rights, Mr. Austin endeavours to collect a general definition of a legal right. He rejects the definitions usually given, as not applicable to all cases. He is of opinion that rights have very few properties in common, and that 'all that can be affirmed of rights, considered universally, amounts to a brief and barren generality.'\* The only definition of a right which he finds himself able to give, is, that whenever a legal duty is to be performed *towards* or *in respect of* some determinate person, that person is invested with a right. The idea of a legal right involves, in his opinion, nothing more.

This is one of the points (extremely few, considering the extent and intricacy of the subject) on which we cannot help thinking that Mr. Austin's analysis falls short of perfect exhaustiveness.

Mr. Austin always recognises, as entitled to great consideration, the custom of language — the associations which mankind already have with terms: insomuch that, when a name already stands for a particular notion (provided that, when brought out into distinct consciousness, the notion is not found to be self-contradictory), the definition should rather aim at fixing that notion, and rendering it determinate, than attempt to substitute another notion for it. A definition of right, so wide and general as that of Mr. Austin, does not, as it appears to us, stand this test. It does not satisfy the conception which is in everyone's mind, of the meaning of the word right. Almost everyone will feel that there is, somehow, an element left out; an element which is approximately, though perhaps imperfectly, expressed by saying that the person who has the right is the person who is meant to be benefited by the imposition of the duty.

In the Lectures as delivered (which included much extemporaneous matter, not preserved in the publication) Mr. Austin anticipated this obvious objection, and combated it. The notion of a right as having necessarily for its purpose the benefit of the person invested with it, is contradicted, he said, by the case of *fiduciary rights*. To these he might have added (and probably did add) the rights of public functionaries—the judge, for instance, or the policeman; which are not created for the benefit of the judge or policeman themselves. These examples are conclusive against the terms of the particular definition

---

\* Vol. ii. (first of the new volumes), p. 56.

contended against: but it will appear, from two considerations, that they do not fully dispose of the subject.

In the first place, Mr. Austin's own definition is amenable to a similar, though contrary, criticism. If the definition which he rejected does not comprise all rights, his own comprises more than rights. It includes cases of obligation to which he himself must have admitted that there were no rights corresponding. For example, the legal duties of jailers. It is a jailer's duty to feed the prisoners in his custody, and to this duty corresponds a correlative right in the prisoners. But it is also his legal duty to keep them in confinement, perhaps in bodily fetters. This case is strictly of the kind contemplated in Mr. Austin's definition of a right; there is a duty to be performed, towards, or in respect to, a determinate person or persons; but would it be said that a corresponding right resided in those persons, or, in other words, that they had a right to be imprisoned, and that their right would be violated by setting them at liberty? Again, it is the duty of the hangman to inflict capital punishment upon all persons lawfully delivered to him for that purpose; but would the culprit himself be spoken of as having a right to be hanged? Certainly not. And the reason is one which Mr. Austin fully recognises. He says, in one place\*, that 'a right 'in a condition which is purely burthensome is hardly conceivable:† and, in another, that 'a right to a burthen, or to 'vindicate the enjoyment of a burthen' is 'an absurdity.' He also, with writers in general, speaks‡ of many obligations as existing for the sake of the correlative rights. If this is a correct expression, there is more in the idea of a right, than an obligation towards or in respect to a given person; since an obligation cannot exist merely in order that there may be a person towards or in respect to whom it exists.

The truth is, that it is not customary to speak of a person as having a right to anything which is not, in the contemplation of the legislator, a desirable thing; and it is always assumed that the person possessing the right is the person-specially interested in enforcing the duty which corresponds to it. Mr. Austin, no less than others, makes this supposition, when, in the common language of jurists, he says, that when a duty is violated, the person who has the right is *wronged* or *injured* by the violation. This desirableness of the right, and this especial vocation on the part of the possessor to defend it, do not necessarily suppose that the right is established for his particular advantage. But it must either be given to

---

\* Vol. ii. p. 52.

† *Ib.* p. 395.

‡ *Ib.* p. 423.

him for that reason, or because it is needful for the performance of his own legal duties. It is consistent with the meaning of words to call that desirable to us, which is required for the fulfilment of our duties. The alternative covers the case of fiduciary rights, the rights of magistrates, and we think every case in which a person can, consistently with custom and with the ends of language, be said to have a right. And, including all such cases, and no others, it seems to supply what is wanting to Mr. Austin's definition. We submit it therefore to the consideration of his readers.

The analysis of right and duty is not complete without an analysis of wrong or injury—the violation of a duty or of a right. And in order to clear up all that is included in the notion of wrong or injury, it is necessary ‘to settle the meaning of the following perplexing terms—viz., will, motive, intention, and negligence, including in the term negligence those *modes* of the corresponding complex notion which are styled ‘temerity or rashness, imprudence or heedlessness.’\* These topics comprise the whole theory of the grounds of imputation; in other words, the *generalia* of criminal or penal law. How much bad law, and bad philosophy of law, have arisen from imperfect comprehension of them, may be seen in the nonsense of English law writers concerning malice. The full elucidation of them by our author occupies a considerable space, and our limits are inconsistent with even the briefest abstract of it. Mr. Austin's special vocation for ‘untying knots,’ which would have fitted him as well for the problems of inductive psychology as for those of jurisprudence, is nowhere called into more successful exercise. Without a single metaphysical subtlety, there cannot be a more happy example than he here affords of metaphysical analysis.

With the idea of wrong, that of sanction is inseparably bound up; and after settling the meaning of sanction in its largest sense, Mr. Austin examines the two kinds into which sanctions are divided—namely, civil and criminal; or, as they are sometimes called, private and public. Whoever has even the most superficial acquaintance with the writings of criminalists, knows what a mass of vague and confusing speculation this distinction has given birth to; though, as pointed out by Mr. Austin, the real difference between civil injuries and crimes consists only in this, that in wrongs of the former class the sanction is enforced at the instance and discretion of the injured party, who has

---

\* Vol. ii. p. 79.



the power of remitting the liability incurred by the wrongdoer ; while, when the offence is called a crime (which only means that the procedure is of the kind called criminal), the sanction is enforced at the discretion of the sovereign or state, by whom alone the liability of the wrongdoer can be remitted. This case is an instance of the mode in which a confused apprehension of juristical ideas in themselves not at all difficult of comprehension, reacts mischievously on practical legislation. The unhappy idea of classifying wrongs according to a difference which exists only in the modes appointed for redressing them, has raised up a notion in English lawyers that there is a distinction between civil injuries and crimes considered *per se*, which makes damages the proper remedy for the one, and punishment for the other. And hence that serious defect in English law, by which punishment *eo nomine*, and damages to the injured party, cannot both be awarded in the same cause ; while in France, on the contrary, the sufferers by the crime can always be admitted as *parties civiles*, and compensation to them is habitually a part of the sentence. In England, whenever the wrong is of so grave a character as to require punishment over and above the obligation of making amends, the injured party loses the indemnity which he would have been able to exact for a less heinous injury ; and the penalty on the criminal is deprived of one of its uses, that of being instrumental to the redress of the particular evil which the crime has inflicted upon an individual.

With the twenty-eighth lecture Mr. Austin commences a new subject—Law considered with reference to its sources, and to the modes in which it begins and ends ; involving the distinction between written and what is called unwritten law, the theory of customary law, the meaning of what is called equity, and the false metaphysical distinction drawn by the Roman lawyers and by nearly all modern jurists, between law natural and positive. These theoretical considerations involve, among other important consequences, the highly practical question of codification, or the reduction of the laws of any country into a compact body, expressed in fixed words, and conforming to a systematic arrangement. Whether we regard the importance of these subjects, or the mass of illogical, unphilosophical, and practically misleading speculation in which they have been enveloped, there is no part of the field of jurisprudence on which the value of precise and logical thought is more conspicuous. Mr. Austin was eminently fitted to supply it, both by the general quality of his intellect, and by that

accurate special knowledge of the history of institutions and of juristical ideas which he had in common with Mr. Maine; of whose masterly treatise also a great part of the value has reference to this cluster of subjects.

Even such apparently simple phrases as 'written' and 'unwritten' law, have their full share of the ambiguity which infects nearly the whole vocabulary of legal science. They are employed to express no less than three different distinctions. 'Written law' is used, first, in its literal sense, to denote law which is put into writing at the time of its origin, as distinguished from 'law originating in custom, or floating tradition—ally amongst lawyers.' But this last so-called law is not really law until re-enacted by the legislature, or enforced judicially by the tribunals.

Secondly, written law, in what is called its juridical sense, means law made directly by the sovereign legislature, as distinguished from that which is made by subordinate legislatures, or by judicial tribunals. In this sense of the term, laws made by provincial or colonial legislatures are unwritten laws, as were also the edicts of the Roman prætors. But the laws made by the Roman emperors, not as legislators by their imperial constitutions, but as supreme judges by their rescripts, would be styled written law, because made directly by the sovereign.

Thirdly (and this is the most important distinction) written law is synonymous with statute law, or law made (whether by supreme or subordinate authorities) in the way of direct legislation. Unwritten law is judiciary law, or law made indirectly, in the way of judicial decision, either by the sovereign in a judicial capacity, or by a subordinate judge. The terms statutory law and judiciary law, being unambiguous, should be exclusively employed where this really fundamental distinction is to be expressed.

Mr. Austin next deals with the strange notion which has prevailed among the Roman and the majority of modern jurists, that customary law exists as law merely by being custom; that it is law not by the will of the legislature, but by the spontaneous act of those who practise it. He exposes the absurdities involved in this notion, and shows that custom in itself belongs not to law, but at most to positive morality, binding only by moral sanctions—by the penalties of opinion. What was originally custom may become law, when either the legislature (supreme or subordinate) enacts a statute in conformity to the custom, or the tribunals recognise it, and enforce it by legal sanctions. In both these ways, custom, in all countries, is con-

tinually passing into law. But it has force as law solely by the authority of the sovereign legislator, who either shapes his direct commands in accordance with the custom, or lends his sanctions to the tribunals, which, in the discretion allowed them, annex those sanctions to the particular practice, and render obligatory what before was only voluntary.

The notion of writers on law 'that there are positive laws 'which exist as positive laws independently of a sovereign 'authority,' is not limited to customary laws. It extends to the laws which, in the Roman system avowedly, and in all others really, are modelled on the opinions and practices of private lawyers. The *Responsa Prudentum*, and the treatises of institutional writers, gave birth to the whole body of law contained in the Pandects; and in England 'much of the law of 'real property is notoriously taken from opinions and practices 'which have grown up, and are daily growing up, amongst conveyancers.' The English tribunals (by what, when first employed, was an entirely indispensable artifice) keep up what Mr. Austin, with reference to present circumstances, justly calls the 'puerile fiction,' that these opinions and practices are mere *evidence* of law already established by custom. But they well know, and every lawyer knows, that the law thus introduced is really new, and, in the case which creates the first precedent, is even *ex post facto*; though not generally liable to the condemnation implied in that term, being commonly shaped for the purpose of fulfilling, not frustrating, the expectations presumed to have been entertained by the parties concerned.

The fact that there is law which the legislature has never expressly announced, but which is, with its tacit consent, made by tribunals which are not regularly authorised to enact law, but only to declare it, has thrown a vagueness over the whole idea of law, which has contributed greatly to obscure the distinction between it and positive morality. The error, that law exists as such independently of legal sanctions, appears in an aggravated shape in the notion that there exists a natural law—a law known by the light of nature, which does not emanate from legislators, but is nevertheless binding on tribunals, and may and ought to be by them enforced by reason of its natural obligation only. This *Jus Naturale* has, as Mr. Austin observes\*, 'thoroughly perplexed and obscured the sciences of 'jurisprudence and ethics.' As the notion admits only of an historical explanation, Mr. Austin deals with it substantially in the same manner as Mr. Maine.

\* Vol. ii. p. 241.

He expounds the origin of the *Jus Gentium* of the early Roman lawyers; a different thing not only from international law, to which the term has been perversely transferred by modern jurists, but also from the Natural Law of modern writers on jurisprudence, though of this last it is the real progenitor. The *jus gentium* took its rise from the necessity in which the Romans found themselves, through the growth of their dominion, of administering justice to persons who were not Romans—to whom the laws provided for Roman citizens were not applicable, and who, belonging to different nations and communities, had originally different laws. Provincials of the same province retained, as between themselves, their old laws; but between a provincial and a Roman citizen, or between provincials of one province and those of another, it was neither convenient, nor would in most cases have been just, to decide disputes by a law which was not the law of both parties. The prætors, whose decision in such cases was probably at first arbitrary, were able to find many legal principles and provisions which were not peculiar to either people (as so much of the early Roman law was peculiar to the Romans) but were common to the laws of all or of many different communities. These principles and provisions, there seemed no hardship in applying to cases between persons of what would now be called different nationalities. And where these did not furnish a rule exactly applicable to the case, the prætors were led to supply the deficiency by rules either derived from them by analogy, or suggested by a sense of substantial justice or expediency. In this manner arose the idea of a body of law not peculiar to one but common to all nations, on which the prætors were supposed, and supposed themselves, to have fashioned the body of positive law which grew up under their hands. This law, being abstracted from the peculiarities both of the *Jus Quiritium* and of all other local and special bodies of law or custom, was, as might naturally be expected, of a more liberal character. It was less charged with technical and circuitous modes of proceeding, invented to evade conflict with local or accidental prejudice. It was less infected by the freaks of fancy which, as Mr. Austin observes, are ‘omnipotent with ‘barbarians,’ but in which one barbarous people is not likely to agree with another. It might be said, by comparison, to represent that portion of all systems which arose from the wants and feelings of human nature generally. Being, for this reason, as well as from its originating in a more civilised period, far preferable to the old Roman law, it became the model on which the prætors, by their edicts, gradually modified the old law

itself; and finally (though not till after many centuries), almost entirely substituted itself for the original Roman law. The provisions of the more liberal *jus gentium*, applied by the prætors as modifying principles to the old law, obtained the name of *Æquitas*, or equity; an appellation which became extended to the somewhat similar process by which the Court of Chancery for ages employed itself in supplying the omissions and mitigating the barbarities of the feudal laws of England. The explanation and elucidation of this one word Equity, in the many senses in which it is used by jurists, forms the subject of several of Mr. Austin's lectures. Both historically and philosophically they are among the most interesting parts of the Course: though much of the matter they contain, when once stated, appears so obvious, that one is apt to forget how often and by what esteemed authorities it has been misunderstood.\*

Now it was this Roman idea of a *jus gentium*, or portion of law common to all nations, which grew insensibly into the modern idea of Natural Law. 'The *Jus Naturale*, or law of nature,' as Mr. Maine observes †, 'is simply the *jus gentium* seen in the 'light of a peculiar theory.' That theory, as both he and Mr. Austin remark, was derived from the precept 'Live according to Nature' of the Greek philosophical schools. 'After Nature had become a household word in the mouths of the Romans, the belief gradually prevailed among the Roman lawyers that the old *jus gentium* was in fact the lost code of Nature, and that the prætor, in framing an Edictal Jurisprudence on the principles of the *jus gentium*, was gradually restoring a type from which law had only departed to deteriorate.'‡ Being observed or recognised universally, these principles were supposed to have a higher origin than human design, and to be (we quote Mr. Austin §) 'not so properly rules of human position or establishment, as rules proceeding

---

\* 'I could point,' says Mr. Austin (vol. ii. p. 273.), 'at books and speeches, by living lawyers of name, wherein the nature of the Equity administered by the Chancellor, or the nature of the jurisdiction (styled extraordinary) which the Chancellor exercises, is thoroughly misunderstood:—wherein the anomalous distinction between Law and Equity is supposed to rest upon principles necessary or universal; or (what is scarcely credible) wherein the functions of the Chancellor, as exercising his extraordinary jurisdiction, are compared to the *arbitrium boni viri*, or to the functions of an *arbiter* released from the observance of rules.'

† Ancient Law, p. 52.

‡ Maine, p. 56.

§ Vol. ii. p. 261.

‘immediately from the Deity himself, or the intelligent and ‘rational Nature which animates and directs the universe.’ This notion, once formed, was, by an obvious process, so enlarged as to include merely moral, or merely customary rules which had obtained general acceptance; ‘every rule, in short, which is ‘common to *all* societies, though the rule may not obtain as ‘positive law in all political communities, or in any political ‘community.’\* In this manner the Natural Law of modern writers was extended to those international usages, and those rules of international morality, which obtained generally among nations. And by a similar process each writer was led to include in his scheme of Natural Law, whatever maxims of justice or utility approved themselves to him as an individual moralist, provided they appeared to be at once self-evident and universal. The writings which profess to treat of the Law of Nature and Nations are a chaos of all these materials. ‘In studying these ‘writers,’ says Mr. Maine †, the great difficulty is always to ‘discover whether they are discussing law or morality—whether ‘the state of international relations they describe is actual or ‘ideal—whether they lay down that which is, or that which in ‘their opinion ought to be.’ This arose from the confused apprehension of the very meaning of law, engendered by their notion of a Law of Nature according to which what in their opinion ought to be law, was conceived as being, in some strange manner, law already. By this confusion they have spread a thick fog over the distinctions and demarcations which separate the three different notions, positive law, positive morality, and deontology, or morality as it ought to be.

The influence of the imaginary Law of Nature over modern thought has been all-pervading; on the whole, however, still greater on the Continent than in England. Mr. Maine very truly affirms‡, that ‘the theory of natural law is the source of ‘almost all the special ideas as to law, politics, and society, ‘which France during the last hundred years has been the ‘instrument of diffusing over the western world. The part’ (he continues) ‘played by jurists in French history, and the ‘sphere of jural conceptions in French thought, have always ‘been remarkably large;’ and in the latter half of the last century, when other old modes of thought were breaking up, the calamitous influence of Rousseau (calamitous at least in this respect) became powerfully operative in strengthening this particular delusion. Coleridge, in the ‘Friend,’ has maintained,

---

\* Vol. ii. p. 260.

† Ancient Law, p. 97.

‡ Maine, p. 80.

with much force of argument, that the thrusting of immutable principles of morality into the province of law, and assuming them as the only legitimate basis of politics, is the essence of Jacobinism. It is the essence not specially of that, but of a general mode of thought which prevails among French thinkers of all political opinions. As a general rule, French speculation knows no distinction or barrier between the province of morals and that of politics or legislation. While, on the one hand, it tends to impose on morals (for this, however, Catholic thought and the influence of the Canonists are partly responsible) all the formality and literalness of juridical rules; on the other, it invests the creations of pure legal institution—the law of property for example—with the sacredness and indefeasibility of the fundamental doctrines of morals; and cannot bear to discuss such a question, for instance, as copyright, on grounds of general expediency, but insists on clenching it by affirming or denying an assumed absolute right in authors to hold the produce of their brain, by themselves or their representatives, as permanent property to the end of time.

The influence, for good and for evil, of the theory of a Law of Nature is delineated by Mr. Maine more fully than was compatible with Mr. Austin's more extensive design. There is no doubt that for a long period the good side of the influence predominated. It assisted mankind in disencumbering themselves from a superstitious reverence for the institutions which had historically grown up in their several countries. It accustomed them to test particular laws by general principles of some sort, and gave them a type of excellence of which simplicity and symmetry were among the supposed characteristics. Finally, it disregarded all distinctions between man and man, between citizen and foreigner, noble and burgess, burgess and peasant; and Mr. Maine is of opinion 'that to the assumption of a Law Natural we owe the doctrine of the 'fundamental equality of human beings.' When almost everything which was artificial was oppressive, the reaction in favour of what was supposed to be natural had a healthy tendency; though we now know that the real natural state (if natural means primitive), instead of being the reign of justice and freedom, is a condition of more universal tyranny than any form whatever of civilised life. But whatever power of liberalising men's minds may once have belonged to the doctrine of Natural Law, that power is now exhausted; the doctrine has done all it can do in that direction, and its remaining influence serves only to make men greater bigots, not indeed to the peculiar vices of any given system, but to what-

ever vices have existed from the beginning in them all. Meanwhile, the theory of law must be a mass of contradiction as long as the imaginary Natural Law retains any authority in it; for as every actual system of law has been shaped out by conflicting instincts, a theory generalised from what they have in common is necessarily full of conflicting principles, and affords, on both sides of every controverted point, arguments which, if the theory be granted, are all equally unanswerable.

In the thirty-seventh lecture Mr. Austin commences discussing the differences which distinguish statute from judiciary law; the advantages and disadvantages of judicial legislation, and the possibility and desirableness of excluding it for the future, and converting all judiciary law into statute—in other words, codification. From this excellent discussion we shall permit ourselves, in consideration of its great practical moment, to give a longer quotation than we have ventured to make from any other portion of the Course. It is taken from the place in which, after remarking on some disadvantages erroneously attributed to judiciary law, Mr. Austin points out the evils which are really inherent in it.

‘First: A judiciary law (or a rule of judiciary law) exists nowhere in fixed or determinate expressions. It lies *in concreto*: or it is implicated with the peculiarities of the particular case or cases, by the decision or decisions whereon, the law or rule was established. Before we can arrive at the rule, we must abstract the *ratio decidendi* (which really constitutes the rule) from all that is peculiar to the case through which the rule was introduced, or to the resolution of which the rule was originally applied. And in trying to arrive at the rule by this process of abstraction and induction, we must not confine our attention to the general positions or expressions which the judicial legislator actually employed. We must look at the whole case which it was his business to decide, and to the whole of the discourse by which he signified his decision. And from the whole of his discourse, combined with the whole of the case, we must extract that *ratio decidendi*, or that general principle or ground, which truly constitutes the law that the particular decision established.

‘But the process of abstraction and induction to which I now have alluded, is not uncommonly a delicate and difficult process; its difficulty being proportioned to the number and the intricacy of the cases from which the rule that is sought must be abstracted and induced. Consequently, a rule of judiciary law is less accessible and knowable than a statute law. . . . And it must be recollected, that whether it be performed by judges applying the rule to subsequent cases, or by private persons in the course of extra-judicial business, this delicate and difficult process is commonly performed in haste. Insomuch that judges in the exercise of their judicial functions, and private persons



in their extra-judicial transactions, must often mistake the import of the rule which they are trying to ascertain and apply.

‘And this naturally conducts me to a *second* objection: namely, that judiciary law (generally speaking) is not only applied in haste, but is also *made* in haste. It is made (generally speaking) in the hurry of judicial business, and not with the mature deliberation which legislation requires, and with which statute law is or might be constructed. . . .

‘There is more of stability and coherency in judiciary law than might, at the first blush, be imagined. But though it be never so stable and never so coherent, every system of judiciary law has all the evils of a system which is really vague and inconsistent. This arises mainly from two causes: the enormous bulk of the documents in which the law must be sought, and the difficulty of extracting the law (supposing the decisions known) from the particular decided cases in which it lies imbedded.

‘By consequence, a system of judiciary law (as every candid man will readily admit) is nearly unknown to the bulk of the community, although they are bound to adjust their conduct to the rules or principles of which it consists. Nay, it is known imperfectly to the mass of lawyers, and even to the most experienced of the legal profession. A man of Lord Eldon’s legal learning, and of Lord Eldon’s acuteness and comprehension, may know where to find the documents in which the law is preserved, and may be able to extract from the documents the rule for which he is seeking. To a man, therefore, of Lord Eldon’s learning, and of Lord Eldon’s acuteness, the law might really serve as a guide of conduct. But by the great body of the legal profession (when engaged in advising those who resort to them for counsel), the law (generally speaking) is divined rather than ascertained: And whoever has seen opinions even of celebrated lawyers, must know that they are often worded with a discreet and studied ambiguity, which, whilst it saves the credit of the uncertain and perplexed adviser, thickens the doubts of the party who is seeking instruction and guidance. And as to the bulk of the community—the simple-minded laity (to whom, by reason of their simplicity, the law is so benign)—they might as well be subject to the mere *arbitrium* of the tribunals, as to a system of law made by judicial decisions. A few of its rules or principles are extremely simple, and are also exemplified practically in the ordinary course of affairs: Such, for example, are the rules which relate to certain crimes, and to contracts of frequent occurrence. And of these rules or principles, the bulk of the community have some notion. But those portions of the law which are somewhat complex, and are not daily and hourly exemplified in practice, are by the mass of the community utterly unknown, and are by the mass of the community utterly unknowable. Of those, for example, who marry, or of those who purchase land, not one in a hundred (I will venture to affirm) has a distinct notion of the consequences which the law annexes to the transaction.

‘Consequently, although judiciary law be really certain and cohe-

rent, it has all the mischievous effect (in regard to the bulk of the community) of *ex post facto* legislation. Unable to obtain professional advice, or unable to obtain advice which is sound and safe, men enter into transactions of which they know not the consequences, and then (to their surprise and dismay) find themselves saddled with duties which they never contemplated.

‘The ordinary course is this:—

‘A man enters into some transaction (say, for example, a contract) either without advice. or with the advice of an incompetent attorney.

‘By consequence, he gets into a scrape.

‘Finding himself in a scrape, he submits a case, through his attorney, to counsel.

‘And, for the fee to attorney and counsel, he has the exquisite satisfaction of learning with certainty that the mischief is irreparable.

[‘I am far from thinking, that the law ever can be so condensed and simplified, that any considerable portion of the community may know the whole or much of it.

‘But I think that it may be so condensed and simplified, that *lawyers* may know it: and that at a moderate expense, the rest of the community may learn from lawyers beforehand the legal effect of transactions in which they are about to engage.

‘Not to mention (as I shall show, when I come to the *rationale* of the distinction between Law of Things and Law of Persons) that the law may be so arranged, that each of the different classes of persons may know something of the part of it with which they are particularly concerned.

‘Forms, too, for the more usual transactions might be made out by the legislature.]

‘The evil upon which I am insisting is certainly not *peculiar* to judiciary law. Statute law badly expressed, and made bit by bit, may be just as bulky and just as inaccessible as law of the opposite kind. But there is this essential difference between the kinds of law. The evil is inherent in judiciary law, although it be as well constructed as judiciary law can be. But statute law (though it often is bulky and obscure) *may be* compact and perspicuous, if constructed with care and skill. . . .

‘Fifthly: I am not aware that there is any *test* by which the validity of a rule made judicially can be ascertained.

‘Is it the *number* of decisions in which a rule has been followed, that makes it law binding on future judges? Or is it the *elegantia* of the rule (to borrow the language of the Roman lawyers), or its consistency and harmony with the bulk of the legal system? Or is it the *reputation* of the judge or judges by whom the case or cases introducing the rule was decided? . . .

‘We never can be absolutely certain (so far as I know) that any judiciary rule is good or valid law, and will certainly be followed by future judges in cases resembling the cases by which it has been introduced.

‘Here, then, is a cause of uncertainty which seems to be of the

essence of *judiciary* law. For I am not aware of any contrivance by which the inconvenience could be obviated. . . .

‘Sixthly: In consequence of the implication of the *ratio decidendi* with the peculiarities of the decided case, the rule established by the decision (or the *ratio*, or the general principle of the decision) is never or rarely comprehensive. It is almost necessarily confined to such future cases as closely resemble the case actually decided: although other cases more remotely resembling may need the care of the legislator. In other words, the rule is necessarily limited to a narrow *species* or sort, although the *genus* or kind, which includes that *species* or sort, ought to be provided for at the same time by one comprehensive law.

‘This is excellently explained by Sir Samuel Romilly:—

“Not only is the judge, who at the very moment when he is making law, is bound to profess that it is his province only to declare it; not only is he thus confined to technical doctrines and to artificial reasoning—he is further compelled to take the narrowest view possible of every subject on which he legislates. *The law he makes is necessarily restricted to the particular case which gives occasion for its promulgation.* Often when he is providing for that particular case or, according to the fiction of our Constitution, is declaring how the ancient and long-forgotten law has provided for it, he represents to himself other cases which probably may arise, though there is no record of their ever having yet occurred, which will as urgently call for a remedy as that which it is his duty to decide. It would be a prudent part to provide, by one comprehensive rule, as well for these possible events, as for the actual case that is in dispute, and, while terminating the existing litigation, to obviate and prevent all future contests. This, however, is, to the judicial legislator, strictly forbidden; and if, in illustrating the grounds of his judgment, he adverts to other and analogous cases, and presumes to anticipate how they should be decided, he is considered as exceeding his province; and the opinions thus delivered are treated by succeeding judges as extrajudicial, and as entitled to no authority.”

‘[Hence, exigencies of society provided for bit by bit, and therefore slowly.]

‘Hence, further, immense volume of the documents in which the law is recorded. For in lieu of one comprehensive rule determining a *genus* of cases, we have many several and narrow rules severally determining the species which that *genus* includes.]

‘And this inconvenience (for a reason which I have noticed above) is probably of the essence of judiciary law. So delicate and difficult is the task of legislation, that any comprehensive rule, made in haste, and under a pressure of business, would probably be ill adapted to meet the contemplated purpose. It is certain that the most experienced, and the most learned and able of our judges, have commonly abstained the most scrupulously from throwing out general propositions which were not as proximate as possible to the case awaiting solution: though the *ratio decidendi* (or ground or principle of decision) is necessarily a general position applying to a class of cases, and does not concern exclusively the particular case in question. . . .

'Seventhly: Wherever much of the law is judiciary law, the statute law which coexists with it, is imperfect, unsystematic, and bulky.

'For the judiciary law is, as it were, the *nucleus* around which the statute law is formed. The judiciary law contains the *legal dictionary*, or the definitions and expositions (in so far as such exist) of the leading technical terms of the entire legal system. The statute law is not a whole of itself, but is formed or fashioned on the judiciary law, and tacitly refers throughout to those leading terms and principles which are expounded by the judiciary. . . .

'Wherever, therefore, much of the law consists of judiciary law, the statute law is not of itself complete, but is merely a partial and irregular supplement to that judiciary law which is the mass and bulk of the system. The statute law is not of itself an edifice, but is merely a set of irregular unsystematic patches stuck from time to time upon the edifice reared by judges. . . .

'Wherever, therefore, much of the law consists of judiciary law, the entire legal system, or the entire *corpus juris*, is necessarily a monstrous chaos: partly consisting of judiciary law, introduced bit by bit, and imbedded in a measureless heap of particular judicial decisions, and partly of legislative law stuck by patches on the judiciary law, and imbedded in a measureless heap of occasional and supplemental statutes.' (Vol. ii. pp. 359-370.)

'Since such' (continues Mr. Austin) 'are the monstrous evils of judicial legislation, it would seem that the expediency of a Code, or of a complete or exclusive body of statute law, will hardly admit of a doubt. Nor would it, provided that the chaos of judiciary law and of the statute law stuck patch-wise on the judiciary could be superseded by a *good* code. For when we contrast the chaos with a positive code, we must not contrast it with the very best of possible or conceivable codes, but with the code which, under the given circumstances of the given community, would probably be the result of an attempt to codify.' The expediency of codification at a particular time and place depends on the question, 'Are there men, then and there, competent to the task of successful codification?' The difficulty of the work no one feels more strongly, or has stated more emphatically, than Mr. Austin. He considers 'the technical part of legislation incomparably more difficult than what may be styled the ethical;' holding it 'far easier to conceive justly what would be useful law, than so to construct that same law that it may accomplish the design of the law-giver: \* an opinion which, in its full breadth of statement, we should hesitate to endorse. But it will readily be admitted that the two qualifications are different, that the one is no

---

\* Vol. ii. p. 371.

guarantee for the other, and that the talent which is merely instrumental is, in any high degree of perfection, nearly if not quite as rare as that to which it is subordinate.

The expediency, therefore, of codification in England and at the present time, Mr. Austin does not discuss; but he shows 'the futility of the leading or principal arguments which 'are advanced against codification, considered generally or in 'abstract.' Unhappily a great part of the matter which he delivered on this subject is missing from the manuscript. But its place is partly supplied by the abundant notes and memoranda relating to the subject, which have been found among his papers, and of which the 'Notes on Codification,' appended to the third volume, are but a part. We shall quote only one passage, which belongs to the Lectures, and is reproduced in the pamphlet on the 'Study of Jurisprudence.' It is a reply to the common objection that statute law cannot include all cases. Mr. Austin shows that it can at least include all those which are covered by judiciary law.

'The current objection to codification, is the necessary incompleteness of a code. It is said that the individual cases which may arise in fact or practice are infinite, and that, therefore, they cannot be anticipated, and provided for, by a body of general rules. The objection (as applied to statute law generally) is thus put by Lord Mansfield in the case of *Omichund and Barker*. (He was then Solicitor-General.) "Cases of Law depend upon occasions which give rise to them. All occasions do not arise at once. A statute very seldom can take in all cases. Therefore the common law that works itself pure by rules drawn from the fountains of justice, is superior to an act of parliament."

'My answer to this objection is, that it is equally applicable to all law; and that it implies in the partisans of judiciary law (who are pleased to insist upon it) a profound ignorance, or a complete forgetfulness, of the nature of the law which is established by judicial decisions.

'Judiciary law consists of *rules*, or it is merely a heap of particular decisions inapplicable to the solution of future cases. On the last supposition, it is not law at all: and the judges who apply decided cases to the resolution of other cases, are not resolving the latter by any determinate law, but are deciding them arbitrarily.

'The truth, however, is, that the general grounds or principles of judicial decisions are as completely law as statute law itself; though they differ considerably from statutes in the manner and form of expression. And being law, it is clear that they are liable to the very imperfection which is objected to statute law. Be the law statute or judiciary, it cannot anticipate all the cases which may possibly arise in practice.

'The objection implies, that all judicial decisions which are not applications of statutes are merely arbitrary. It therefore involves a

double mistake. It mistakes the nature of judiciary law, and it confounds law with the *arbitrium* of the judge. Deciding arbitrarily, the judge, no doubt, may provide for all possible cases. But whether providing for them thus be providing for them by law, I leave it to the judicious to consider.

‘If law, as reduced into a code, would be incomplete, so is it incomplete as not so reduced. For codification is the re-expression of existing law. It is true that the code might be incomplete, owing to an oversight of redactors. But this is an objection to codification in particular . . .

‘Repetition and inconsistency are far more likely, where rules are formed one by one (and, perhaps, without concert, by many distinct tribunals), than where all are made at once by a single individual or body, who are trying to embrace the whole field of law, and so to construct every rule as that it may harmonise with the rest.

‘And here I would make a remark which the objection in question suggests, and which to my understanding is quite conclusive.

‘Rules of judiciary law are not decided cases, but the *general* grounds or principles (or the *rationes decidendi*) whereon the cases are decided. Now, by the practical admission of those who apply these grounds or principles, they may be codified, or turned into statute laws. For what is that process of induction by which the principle is gathered before it is applied, but this very process of codifying such principles, performed on a particular occasion, and performed on a small scale? If it be possible to extract from a case, or from a few cases, the *ratio decidendi*, or general principle of decision, it is possible to extract from all decided cases their respective grounds of decisions, and to turn them into a body of law, abstract in its form, and therefore compact and accessible. Assuming that judiciary law is really law, it clearly may be codified.

‘I admit that no code can be complete or perfect. But it may be less incomplete than judge-made law, and (if well constructed) free from the great defects which I have pointed out in the latter. It may be brief, compact, systematic, and therefore knowable as far as it goes.’ (Vol. ii. pp. 374–377.)

The ‘Notes on Codification’ contain, in substance, all that is required to meet any of the objections against codification generally, or in the abstract\*; but their form is too completely

---

\* The most popular, though one of the most superficial, of the objections, is the supposed failure of existing codes, especially the French and the Prussian. To this Mr. Austin answers, substantially, two things: First, that the failure of the French and Prussian codes has been greatly exaggerated, and that, with all their defects, they are still vastly superior to the state of things which preceded them. Secondly, that in so far as those codes do fall short of what is required in a code, it is owing to defects which are obvious and avoidable and, above all, because *they are not really codes*; for the Code Napoleon is without a single definition, and the

that of a mere syllabus, to be acceptable to the general reader. We shall quote, however, as a specimen, and for its practical importance, one excellent passage, containing the author's view of the real difficulties of codification, and the conditions necessary for rendering it advisable.

'The great difficulty is, the impossibility that any one man should perform the whole. But if done by several, it would be incoherent, unless all were imbued with the same principles, and all versed in the power of applying them. The great difficulty, therefore, is to get a sufficient number of competent men, versed in common studies and modes of reasoning. This being given, codification is practicable and expedient.

'*Peculiarly technical and partial knowledge of English lawyers.* No English lawyer is master even of English law, and has, therefore, no notion of that interdependency of parts of a system, on which its successful codification must depend.

'*A code must be the work of many minds.* The project must be the work of one, and revised by a commission. The general outline, the work of one, might be filled up by divers.

'*All-importance in codification of the first intention.* Till minds are trained, it will scarcely succeed. How the difficulty is to be surmounted. Necessity for men versed in theory, and equally versed in practice; or rather, of a combination of theorists and practitioners. Necessity for preliminary digests; or for waiting till successful jurists and jurisprudence are formed through effectual legal education.' (Vol. iii. p. 278.)

Having concluded the subject of Law in general, regarded under its different aspects, Mr. Austin proceeds to consider the parts of which a *corpus juris* is necessarily composed, and the mutual relations of those parts. As already observed, he adheres in the main, though with some not unimportant improvements, to the classification and arrangement of the Roman law; or rather of its modern expositors, who have carried out the ideas of the classical jurists with a precision still greater than theirs.

Mr. Austin gives excellent reasons for rejecting their primary division, followed by most modern writers, into public and private law, and shows how the various parts which compose the former of these should be disposed of.\* This being set

---

Prussian Code has none that are adequate, so that the meaning of all the law terms had either to be fixed by judiciary law, or ascertained by referring back to the old law which was supposed to have been superseded. Far from being any evidence against a code, those compilations are a most satisfactory proof of the great amount of good which can be done even by the merest digest.

\* Lecture 44.

aside, the leading division is into what are termed by the Roman lawyers, Law of Persons and Law of Things—*jus personarum* and *jus rerum*, strangely mistranslated by Hale and Blackstone into *rights* of persons and *rights* of things. The original expressions are extremely ill-chosen, and have been an *ignis fatuus* to law writers, both in ancient and modern times. The Law of Persons (agreeably to one of the meanings of the word *persona*) is the law of *Status* or conditions—of the rights and obligations peculiar to certain *classes* of persons, on whom a peculiar legal stamp has been set. And, in contradistinction, the Law of Things is the law common to all persons, together with the peculiar laws relating to other classes of persons not so specially marked out from the rest. But this has seldom been properly understood by law writers. They have imagined that persons (*personæ*), in this acceptation, meant persons in the ordinary sense—human beings; and forgetting that in this sense all law, and all rights and obligations, relate to persons, they supposed that the Law of Persons, as distinguished from that of Things, ought to contain all law which deals with those interests of persons which have no (or but slight) reference to things. Hence Blackstone places in the Law of Persons what he calls Absolute Rights, being those which belong to all persons without exception, such as the right to life, to personal security, to reputation—rights which, looked at from the point of view of the Roman lawyers, belong even more pre-eminently than any others to the Law of Things.

Those jurists who have understood the meaning of the Roman lawyers more correctly than Blackstone, have exhausted their ingenuity in search of metaphysical reasons why some peculiarities of legal position have been accounted Status, and included in *jus personarum*, while others, equally marked and equally important, have been retained in the Law of Things. Mr. Austin minutely examines and criticises these subtleties, and, after a full review of them, decides that the division has no logical or metaphysical basis at all. It rests solely on convenience. Executors, heirs, trustees, proprietors, contractors, &c., are as much classes of persons as parents, guardians, infants, magistrates, and the like; yet they are never accounted status; and the laws which concern them are always included in the Law of Things. No reason can be given why the one group should, and the other should not, be detached from the general body of the law and placed apart, except that the laws relating to the one 'have no necessary coherency with the bulk of the 'legal system,' and need not, generally speaking, be taken into consideration in order to understand the law as a whole; while



the others 'have such a coherency with the bulk of the legal system, that if they were detached from it the requisite continuity in the statement or exposition of it would be lost.'\*

As much of the law, then, as relates to certain peculiar legal positions, is remanded to a separate branch, which naturally should be placed *after* the general law, or *jus rerum*. The Roman institutional writers, by placing the Law of Persons first, gave one among several proofs that even they had not a perfectly clear conception of the distinction which they had themselves drawn.

In proceeding to subdivide the Law of Things, Mr. Austin adopts from the Roman lawyers their principle of grounding the general division of the *corpus juris* upon a classification of rights. But he selects as his primary division of rights (and of the corresponding duties) a distinction not specially recognised by those writers.

The Roman lawyers primarily divided rights into *jura in rem*, or rights availing against all the world, and *jura in personam*, or rights availing against determinate persons only.† Of the former, the right of dominion or property is the most familiar instance. My right of ownership in a thing, is constituted by a duty or obligation imposed on all persons not to deprive me of the thing, or molest me in its enjoyment. Of rights *in personam*, the most prominent example is a right by virtue of a contract. If B has contracted with A to deliver certain goods, A has a right, answering to the legal obligation on B, but the right is against B alone. Until they are delivered, A has acquired no right to the goods as against other persons. If the goods came into the possession of a third party, through (for example) a wrongful resale by B, A would still have his original right as against B, and might have a right to damages besides, but he could not by process of law recover the goods themselves from the new possessor. A's right, therefore, is not *in rem*, but *in personam*, meaning *in personam determinatam*. The distinction between these two classes of rights belongs to universal jurisprudence, for every system of law must establish rights of both kinds; and the difference between them is connected with practical differences in the legal remedies. Among rights *in rem* must be reckoned the right to life, to reputation, to the free

\* Vol. ii. p. 413.

† These phrases were devised by the modern civilians. The classical jurists expressed the same distinction by the ambiguous terms *dominium* (in the largest sense in which that word was employed) and *obligatio*, a name which, in the Roman law, is unfortunately given to rights as well as to obligations.

disposal of one's person and faculties, to exemption from bodily harm or indignity, and to any external thing of which one is the legal owner. To these must be added the limited right in a thing owned by some one else, which is called *servitus* or easement, such as a right of way over another person's land.

Rights *in personam*, or availing against a determinate person or persons, are divided by Roman jurists into rights (in their unhappy phraseology *obligationes*) *ex contractu*, and rights (or *obligationes*) *ex delicto*, with two miscellaneous appendages, rights *quasi ex contractu* and *quasi ex delicto*. By quasi-contracts are not to be understood implied contracts, differing from express ones only in that the engagement is signified by conduct instead of words. Such tacit engagements are real contracts, and are placed in the law of contract. The term quasi-contract applies to cases in which there has not been, and is known not to have been, any engagement, either express or tacit, but in which the ends of legislation require that the same legal obligations shall be imposed as if the party had entered into an engagement. The case commonly used as an illustration is *solutio indebiti*—the obligation of a person to whom a payment has been made under a mistake, to refund the amount. Obligations *quasi ex contractu* are, therefore, simply *miscellaneous* obligations which cannot be reduced to any of the other classes. The third class, obligations (or rights) arising from offences, is, we venture to say, a stumblingblock to all clear-headed persons when they begin the study of the Roman law. Mr. Austin retains it, but suppresses the fourth class, *quasi ex delicto*, it being quite needless to have two repositories for merely miscellaneous obligations without any positive feature in common. The term quasi-contracts, rightly understood, includes them all. As Mr. Austin expresses it\*, 'one fiction suffices.' 'The terms are merely a sink into which such obligatory incidents as are not contracts, or not delicts, but beget an obligation *as if*, &c., are thrown without discrimination. And this is the rational view which Gaius has taken of the subject.'

Though Mr. Austin retains the class of rights *ex delicto*, it is here that his classification most materially deviates from that of the Roman jurists. Instead of making rights *ex delicto* a secondary, he makes them a primary class. Instead of co-ordinating them with rights from contract and from quasi-contract, as species of *jura in personam*, he opposes them to all other rights, *in rem* and *in personam* taken together. His division of rights in general, is into Primary, and what he terms

---

\* Vol. iii. p. 134.

**Sanctioning, Rights.** The characteristic of these is, that they exist only for the sake of the primary. Primary rights and duties have a legal existence only by virtue of their sanctions. But in order that the sanctions may be applied, legal provisions are necessary, by which other rights are created and duties imposed. These secondary rights and duties are the subject-matter of Penal Law and of the Law of Procedure. They correspond partly (though, as we shall see, not entirely) with the *obligationes ex delicto* of the Romans, and admit of being classed as rights and duties arising out of offences. As such, they are again divided by Mr. Austin into 'Rights and Duties arising from Civil Injuries,' and 'Duties and other Consequences arising from Crimes.' The basis which the Roman jurists assumed for their division of rights in general—the distinction between rights *in rem* and *in personam*—is retained by Mr. Austin only for primary rights. The following table, abridged from one annexed to the author's Outline, will serve as a rough ground-plan of his distribution of the field of law:—

Law				
Law of Things			Law of Persons or Status	
Primary rights (and duties)		Sanctioning rights (and duties)		
Rights <i>in rem</i>	Rights <i>in personam</i>	Combinations of rights <i>in rem</i> and rights <i>in personam</i>	Rights and duties derived from Civil Injuries	Duties and other consequences arising from Crimes.
Rights <i>ex contractu</i>	Rights <i>quasi ex contractu</i>			

The remaining lectures are devoted to the examination and elucidation of the particulars included under these heads. And, with all their incompleteness (which, as with the broken arches in Addison's Vision, becomes greater as we approach the point where they cease altogether), their value to the student will be found to be very great. We would particularly direct attention to the treatment of *Dominium* or Property, in its various senses, with the contrasted conception of *servitus* or easement. The nature and boundaries of these two kinds of rights are made so transparently clear, that it requires some acquaintance with the speculations of jurists to be able to believe that any one could ever have misunderstood the subject.

But is the division and arrangement of law in general, expressed in the table, wholly unimpeachable? We do not mean in point of mere correctness. It satisfies the fundamental rules of logical division. It covers the whole subject, and no one part overlaps another. It affords an arrangement in which it is at

least possible to lay out perspicuously the whole of the matter ; and if the proper mode of ordering and setting out a body of law is to ground it upon a classification of rights, no better one for the purpose could probably be made.

But the purely logical requisites are not the only qualities desirable in a scientific classification. There is a further requisite—that the division should turn upon the most important features of the things classified ; in order that these and not points of minor importance, may be the points on which attention is concentrated. A classification which does this, is what men of science mean when they speak of a Natural Classification. To fulfil this condition may require, according to circumstances, different principles of division ; since the most important properties may either be those which are most important practically, by their bearing on human interests, or those which are most important scientifically, as rendering it easiest to understand the subject—which will generally be the most *elementary* properties.

In the case now under consideration, both these indications coincide. They both point to the same principle of division. Law is a system of means for the attainment of ends. The different ends for which different portions of the law are designed, are consequently the best foundation for the division of it. They are at once what is most practically important in the laws, and the fundamental element in the conception of them—the one which must be clearly understood to make anything else intelligible. Is, then, this requirement, of distinguishing the parts of the *corpus juris* from one another according to the ends which they subserve, fulfilled by a division which turns entirely upon a classification of rights ?

It would be so, if the ends of different portions of the law differed only in respect of the different kinds of Rights which they create. But this is not the fact. The rights created by a law are sometimes the end or purpose of the law, but are not always so.

In the case of what Mr. Austin terms Primary Rights, the rights created are the very reason and purpose of the law which creates them. That these rights may be enjoyed is the end for which the law is enacted, the duties imposed, and the sanctions established.

In that part of the law, however, which presupposes and grows out of wrongs—the law of civil injuries, of crimes, and of civil and criminal procedure—the case is quite otherwise. There are, it is true, rights (called, by Mr. Austin, Sanctioning Rights) created by this portion of the law, and necessary to its

existence. But the laws do not exist for the sake of these rights; the rights, on the contrary, exist for the sake of the laws. They are a portion of the means by which those laws effect their end. The purpose of this part of the law is not the creation of rights, but the application of sanctions, to give effect to the rights created by the law in its other departments. The sanctioning rights are merely instrumental to the sanctions; but the sanctions are themselves instrumental to the primary rights. The filiation of the ideas, proceeding from the simple to the more complex, is as follows:—

1. Primary Rights, with the correlative Duties.
2. Sanctions.
3. Laws determining the mode of applying the Sanctions.
4. Rights and Duties established by those laws, for the sake of, and as being necessary to, the application of the Sanctions.

It appears from these considerations, that however suitable a groundwork the classification of rights may be for the arrangement of that portion of the law which treats of Primary Rights (commonly called the Civil Code)—in the Penal Code and Code of Procedure the rights thereby created are but a secondary consideration, on which it is not well to bestow the prominence which is given to them by carrying out into those branches the same principle of classification. We do not mean that rights *ex delicto* can be left out of the classification of rights for the purposes of the Civil Code. They are rights, and being so, cannot be omitted in the catalogue. But they should, we apprehend, be merely mentioned there, and their enumeration and definition reserved for a separate department, of which the subject should be, not Rights, but Sanctions. If this view be correct, the primary division of the body of law should be into two parts. First, the Civil Law, containing the definition and classification of rights and duties: Secondly, the law of Wrongs and Remedies. This last would be subdivided into Penal Law, which treats of offences and punishments, and the Law of Procedure. If this were a mere opinion of our own, we should hesitate to assert it against a judge in all respects so much more competent as Mr. Austin; but if his great authority is against us, we have with us that of Bentham, James Mill, and the authors of, we believe, all modern codes.

Not only does this more commonplace distribution and arrangement of the *corpus juris* appear to us more scientific than Mr. Austin's; we apprehend that it is also more convenient. Mr. Austin, in fact, has been driven, by the plan he adopted, to the introduction of a logical anomaly, which he

himself acknowledges. There are, as he rightly holds, legal duties which are absolute, that is, which have not only for their ultimate but for their immediate and direct object the *general* good, and not the good of any determinate person or persons, and to which, therefore, there are no correlative rights. Now, in a classification grounded wholly on rights, there is no place for duties which do not correspond to any rights. It being impossible to class these duties with *jura in rem* or *in personam*, Mr. Austin treats of them under the head of Sanctioning Rights. The difficulty, however, is not in knowing under what kind of rights to place them, but in placing them under rights at all. Duties which answer to no rights, have no more natural affinity with Sanctioning than they have with Primary rights. Why then is this, as it undoubtedly is, their proper place in the classification? Because, though the duties have no affinity with rights, the wrongs which are violations of those duties have an affinity with the wrongs which are violations of rights. Violations of absolute duties are Crimes; many violations of rights are also Crimes; and between crimes of these two sorts there is no generic difference which it is necessary that either penal law or criminal procedure should recognise. Now, if the second great division of the law is regarded (which we think it ought to be) as conversant not directly with Rights, but with Wrongs, the wrongs in question, which are violations of absolute duties, take their place among other wrongs as a matter of course. But in a classification grounded on Rights, they are altogether an anomaly and a blot. There is no place marked out for them by the principle of the classification; and to include them in it, recourse must be had to a second principle, which, except for that purpose, the classification does not recognise. It has been seen in the table, that, in the second division of Mr. Austin's Sanctioning Rights, he drops rights altogether, and speaks of 'duties and other consequences.'

But this is not the only nor the greatest objection which may be made, both on the ground of scientific symmetry and of practical convenience, against the place assigned by Mr. Austin to the law of Wrongs and Remedies. A still stronger objection is manifest from a mere inspection of the table. It interpolates the entire subjects of Penal Law and Procedure between the general Civil Law of Things and the Law of Status; that is, between two subjects so closely allied, that after a strenuous application of his powerful intellect to the subject, Mr. Austin was unable to draw a definite line, or find any essential or scientific difference between them; and was induced

to separate them at all, only by the convenience of treating the genus first, and a few of its more complex species afterwards. As he himself says\*, the law of any and of all Status is 'indissolubly connected with that more general matter which 'is contained in the Law of Things.' These two portions of law are conversant with the same general ideas—namely, rights and their definitions (to a great degree even with the same kinds of rights): and one of them is but a kind of appendix or extension of the other, so that there is often a doubt in which compartment a particular chapter or title of the law may best be placed; yet the one is put at the beginning of the *corpus juris*, the other at the end, and between them lies all that great portion of the law which has to do with the subsequent considerations of Offences, Punishments, Judicature, and Judicial Procedure. We cannot think that this is a mode of arrangement which would have approved itself to Mr. Austin's, on such subjects, almost infallible judgment, had he ever completed his Course.

It may be remarked that, though the arrangement which we have criticised was founded on that of the classical Roman jurists, the criticism is not fairly applicable to those jurists themselves. According to the plan of their treatises, they had no alternative. They could not treat of delicts under any other form than that of '*obligationes quæ ex delicto nascuntur.*' For, as Mr. Austin himself observes, their institutional writings were solely on *private* law. Public law was, it is uncertain for what reason, excluded. But crimes, and criminal procedure, belonged to their conception of Public law. Of these, therefore, they had not to treat.† Civil procedure they did treat of; but they placed it in a branch apart, which was neither *jus rerum* nor *personarum*, but a third division coordinate with them, called *Jus Actionum*. There remained only the law of civil injuries. Now, the specific character which distinguishes civil injuries from crimes is that, though the sanction is in both cases the leading idea, the mode in which, in the case of civil injuries, the sanction is applied, is by giving to the injured party a right to compensation or redress, which, like his other rights, he may exercise or forego at his pleasure. It is evident that there is not in this case the same impropriety as in the case of crimes or of procedure, in considering the right created as the

---

\* Vol. ii. p. 439.

† The single title appended to Justinian's Institutes, *De Publicis Judiciis*, is supposed to have been an afterthought, and to have had no chapter corresponding to it in the institutional treatises of the classical jurists.

real purpose of the law. It is true that, even in this case, another purpose of the law is punishment; but the law is willing to forego that object, provided the injured person consents to waive it. The right, therefore, of the injured person, in this particular class of injuries, might without absurdity be treated as the principal object. Being a right availing only against determinate persons—namely, the offender or his representatives—it is a right *in personam*, or, in the language of the classical jurists, an *obligatio*; and its particular nature afforded no reason why it should not, in an arrangement in all other respects dictated by the exigencies of the civil code, take its place where alone, in such an arrangement, a place could be assigned to it—namely, under the general head of *Jura in Personam*, as a sub-species. But this, though it accounts for the place assigned in the Roman law to '*obligationes quæ ex delicto nascuntur*,' forms no reason for applying the same arrangement to the whole law of wrongs and remedies, and making it the basis of a division including the entire field of the *corpus juris*—crimes, punishments, civil and criminal procedure among the rest.

After treating of *dominium* in the narrower sense in which it is opposed to *servitus*—a right to use or deal with a thing in a manner which, though not unlimited, is indefinite, as distinguished from a right to use or deal with a thing in a manner not only limited but definite—Mr. Austin proceeds to treat of rights limited or unlimited as to duration; of rights vested and contingent; and of *dominium* or property in the more emphatic sense in which it denotes the largest right which the law recognises over a thing—a right not only indefinite in extent and unlimited in duration, but including the power of alienating the thing from the person who would otherwise take it by succession. The Lectures finally break off, where they were interrupted by ill health, in the middle of the important subject of Title. There is no finer specimen of analytical criticism in these volumes than the comment (in the Notes to the Tables) on the erroneous and confused notions which the Roman jurists connected with their distinction between *Titulus* and *Modus Acquirendi*.

It cannot be too deeply regretted that, through the combined effect of frequently-recurring attacks of depressing illness, and feelings of discouragement which are vividly reproduced in the touching preface of the editor, Mr. Austin did not complete his Lectures in the form of a systematic treatise. We are fully persuaded that, had he done so, the result would have proved



those feelings of discouragement to be ill grounded. The success of the first volume, by no means the most attractive part of the Course, is a proof that even then there was in the more enlightened part of the legal profession a public prepared for such speculations; a public not numerous, but intellectually competent—the only one which Mr. Austin desired. Had he produced a complete work on jurisprudence, such as he, and perhaps only he in his generation, was capable of accomplishing, he would have attracted to the study every young student of law who had a soul above that of a mere trader in legal learning; and many non-professional students of social and political philosophy (a class now numerous, and eager for an instruction which unhappily for the most part does not yet exist) would have been delighted to acquire that insight into the rationale of all legal systems, without which the scientific study of politics can scarcely be pursued with profit, since juridical ideas meet, and, if ill understood, confuse the student at every turning and winding in that intricate subject. Before the end of the period to which Mr. Austin's life was prolonged, he might have stood at the head of a school of scientific jurists, such as England has now little chance of soon possessing. But the remains which he has left, fragmentary though much of them be, are a mine of material for the future. He has shown the way, solved many of the leading problems, and made the path comparatively smooth for those who follow. Among the younger lawyers of the present time, there must surely be several (independently of the brilliant example of Mr. Maine) who possess the capacity and can acquire the knowledge required for following up a work so well begun; and whoever does so will find, in the notes and miscellaneous papers which compose the latter part of the third volume, a perfect storehouse of helps and suggestions.

It remains to say a few words on the question of execution. A work left unfinished, and never really composed as a book, however mature and well-digested its thoughts, is not a proper subject for literary criticism. It is from the first volume only that we are able to judge what, in point of composition, Mr. Austin would have made it. But all the merits of expression which were found in that volume reappear in quite an equal degree in the remainder, and even, as far as the case admitted, in the looser memoranda. The language is pure and classical English, though here and there with something of an archaic tinge. In expression as in thought, precision is always his first object. It would probably have been so, whatever had been the subject treated; but on one in which the great and fatal

hindrance to rational thought is vague and indefinite phrases, this was especially imperative. Next after precision, clearness is his paramount aim; clearness alike in his phraseology and in the structure of his sentences. His preeminent regard to this requisite gives to his style a peculiarity the reverse of agreeable to many readers, since he prefers, on system, the repetition of a noun substantive, or even of an entire clause, in order to dispense with the employment of the little words *it* and *them*, which he is quite right in regarding as one of the most frequent sources of ambiguity and obscurity in composition. If there be some excess here, it is the excess of a good quality, and is a scarcely appreciable evil, while a fault in the contrary direction would have been a serious one. In other respects Mr. Austin's style deserves to be placed very high. His command of apt and vigorous expression is remarkable, and when the subject permits, there is an epigrammatic force in the turn of his sentences which makes them highly effective.

Some readers may be offended at the harsh words which he now and then uses, not towards persons, to whom he is always, at the lowest, respectful, but towards phrases and modes of thought which he considers to have a mischievous tendency. He frequently calls them 'absurd,' and applies to them such epithets as 'jargon,' 'fustian,' and the like. But it would be a great injustice to attribute these vehement expressions to dogmatism, in any bad sense of the word—to undue confidence in himself, or disclaim of opponents. They flowed from the very finest part of his character. He was emphatically one who hated the darkness and loved the light. He regarded unmeaning phrases and confused habits of thinking as the greatest hindrance to human intellect, and through it to human virtue and happiness. And, thinking this, he expressed the thought with corresponding warmth, for it was one of his noble qualities that while, whatever he thought, he thought strongly, his feelings always went along with his thoughts. The same *perferendum ingenium* made him apply the same strong expressions to any mistake which he detected in himself. In a passage of the *Lectures*\*, he says, referring to a former lecture, 'I said so and 'so. But that remark was absurd; for it would prove,' &c. And in an extemporaneous passage, which some of his hearers may remember, he rated himself soundly for an erroneous opinion which he had expressed, and conjectured, as he might have done respecting a complete stranger to him, what might have been the causes that led him into so gross a misapprehension.

\* Vol. iii. p. 24.

That the occasional strength of his denunciations had its source in a naturally enthusiastic character, combined in him with an habitually calm and deliberate judgment, is shown by the corresponding warmth which marks his expressions of eulogium. He was one in whom the feelings of admiration and veneration towards persons and things that deserve it, existed in a strength far too rarely met with among mankind. It is from such feelings that he speaks of 'the godlike Turgot;' that, in mentioning Locke\*, he commemorates 'that matchless power of precise and 'just thinking, with that religious regard for general utility and 'truth, which marked the incomparable man who emancipated 'human reason from the yoke of mystery and jargon;' that he does homage, in many passages of the Lectures, to the great intellectual powers of Thibaut and Von Savigny, and that, in a note at page 248. of his first volume, he devotes to Hobbes perhaps the noblest vindication which that great but unpopular thinker has ever received. That Mr. Austin was capable of similar admiration for the great qualities of those from whose main scheme of thought he dissents, and whose authority he is oftener obliged to thrust aside than enabled to follow, is shown in many passages, and in none more than in some remarks on Kant's 'Metaphysical Principles of the Science of Law.'† We may add that his praises are not only warm, but (probably without exception) just; that such severity as is shown, is shown towards doctrines, very rarely indeed towards persons, and is never, as with vulgar controversialists, a substitute for refutation, but always and everywhere a consequence of it.

---

\* Province of Jurisprudence, vol. i. p. 150.

† 'A treatise darkened by a philosophy which, I own, is my aversion, but abounding, I must needs admit, with traces of rare sagacity. He has seized a number of notions, complex and difficult in the extreme, with distinctness and precision which are marvellous considering the scantiness of his means. For, of positive systems of law he had scarcely the slightest tincture, and the knowledge of the principles of jurisprudence which he borrowed from other writers, was drawn, for the most part, from the muddiest sources; from books about the fustian which is styled the "Law of Nature." (Vol. iii. p. 167.)

ART. VI.—1. *The History of the Royal Academy of Arts from its Foundation in 1768 to the Present Time, with Biographical Notices of all its Members.* By WILLIAM SANDBY. In two volumes. London: 1862.

2. *Report from the Council of the Royal Academy to the General Assembly of Academicians.* 1860.

3. *Report of the Royal Commission appointed to enquire into the Present Position of the Royal Academy in relation to the Fine Arts, together with Minutes of Evidence, &c.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty. 1863.

MR. SANDBY'S History of the Royal Academy was published under an unlucky star. It contains a large quantity of curious and instructive materials, not always employed with the taste and skill the subject required, but abundant enough to fill a great deficiency in the annals of British Art. It directed attention to the services which the Royal Academy has rendered to the arts and to artists in this country, at a time when some merited censure had been combined with a vast deal of unmerited unpopularity to disparage the most important of our art-institutions. It anticipated to a considerable extent the inquiry which has since been carried on under the auspices of a Royal Commission. Such a work was certainly needed to satisfy and inform the public, and to do justice to the Academy itself. Mr. Sandby bears a name which has been connected with the institution from its foundation, for Paul Sandby (we presume his grandfather) was one of the original Academicians named in 1768 by King George III., and Thomas Sandby the architect was also a member of the body. But, unluckily, in his desire to render the biographical notices of living Academicians as complete as possible, this writer was supposed to have committed a literary trespass on the rights of others who had laboured in the same field; and as it appeared that some portions of the work might be made the subject of proceedings in a court of equity, the whole impression was withdrawn from circulation as soon as this discovery was made, and it is probable that few copies of the work in its original form are in existence. The book, therefore, may be said to have passed out of the sphere of criticism: like the newly-born martyr of the Roman poet,

‘Vixit

Hoc habuit tantum, possit ut ille mori.’

The historical facts that it contained must be sought for in

other forms; and the details it might have furnished as to the present condition of the Academy will be found with greater completeness and authority in the reports of the Academy itself, which are now accessible to the public, and in the highly interesting evidence taken before the Royal Commission of last spring. From these sources we shall endeavour to make our readers acquainted with the leading points in several questions which are now agitated among artists and the friends of art, and which will probably be decided by Parliament in the course of the next Session.

There is one class of objectors and opponents of the existing Royal Academy, to whom it may be well to advert at the outset of these remarks, because they must be considered as entirely beyond the reach of any argument we can address to them—we mean, those persons who think that academies are mischievous and injurious to the culture of the arts, and who would sweep them away altogether. It is true that like all other human institutions they have their defects—sometimes they have been distracted by professional cabals, sometimes they have been used for purposes of professional injustice—frequently they have encouraged and perpetuated that mannerism of the schools which is destructive to talent and repugnant to genius. Hogarth, who took a very desponding view of the future destinies of English art, and held that portrait-painting was the only branch of it which was likely to succeed, recorded his opinion that ‘it would be vain to force what can never be accomplished, at least by such institutions as Royal Academies:’ and that ‘hereafter’ if the times altered, the ‘arts like water would find their level.’ Fuseli, in one of his bursts of scornful sarcasm, exclaimed, that ‘all schools of painters, whether public or private, supported by patronage or individual contributions, were, and are, symptoms of art in distress,—monuments of public dereliction and decay of taste:’ but he added a moment afterwards, in a kindlier and truer spirit, ‘yet they are, at the same time, the asylum of the student, the theatre of his exercises, the repositories of the materials, the archives of the documents of our art, whose principles their officers are bound now to maintain, and for the preservation of which they are responsible to posterity.’

To these charges the history of the Royal Academy in England gives, we think, an effectual answer, and we shall presently endeavour to show what it has actually done, with no direct assistance of the State. But it would be strange if in this country, where such important results are continually obtained by association—where every science has its society, and every

profession its organised system of self-government, the artists alone should be left to their individual exertions. No class of persons stands so much in need of corporate action. Artists are men who commonly owe their social position entirely to the genius and skill they have displayed in their profession. They are not often possessed of wide general attainments: many of them have not received a liberal education; they are not men of the world; they are peculiarly sensitive, and peculiarly dependent on the taste or even the caprice of the public. Many of the greatest artists have belonged to the humbler classes of society by their origin, but have risen by their gifts to the highest intellectual and social rank. They form, by the refinement of their taste and the beauty of their productions, a sort of natural aristocracy; and, like the members of a political aristocracy, much of their strength lies in their cohesion. Their works are commonly produced in retirement, but they seek for exhibition the full glare of publicity. The painter's studio is a cell of retreat: the painter's works belong to the palaces of the nation. To such a man the means of intimate professional combination for certain purposes with his brother artists is of the highest value: and no amount of public favour or success can outweigh with him the consideration he derives from those who are engaged in the same task, and contending for the same prizes. In all the greatest periods of art, these fraternities of artists have exercised a most beneficial influence: and in our own times the problem to be solved by the Royal Academy of Arts is to combine the largest amount of these social advantages with the greatest degree of personal freedom and independence to the genius of the individual artist. We contend, therefore, that a well-governed Academy of the Fine Arts ought to supply to the youthful artist those opportunities of study and that sound instruction in the common principles and practice of art which is the basis of all excellence; to the mature artist the means of union and co-operation with the most distinguished members of his profession, and of submitting his works to the judgment of the public; and to the aged artist those honours which he may have earned, and in some cases that assistance which he may require. In the original memorial addressed by the artists to the King in November, 1768, when they solicited his avowed patronage and protection, the following modest passage occurs:—

‘We only beg leave to inform Your Majesty that the two principal objects we have in view are, the establishing a well-regulated School or Academy of Design, for the use of Students in the Arts, and an annual exhibition, open to all artists of distinguished merit, where

they may offer their performances to public inspection, and acquire that degree of reputation and encouragement which they shall be deemed to deserve.

'We apprehend that the profits arising from the last of these institutions will fully answer all the expenses of the first; we even flatter ourselves they will be more than necessary for that purpose, and that we shall be enabled annually to distribute somewhat in useful charities.'

In other words, the schools, the exhibitions, and some provision for declining life or for the families of artists, are the three leading objects to be secured by such institutions. To this may be added the influence which a body comprising the most eminent professors of the arts ought to exercise on the taste of the nation. The Academy ought to be the link of connexion between the body of artists and those social and political interests which are closely related to the Arts. It ought to be the centre of art-education, directing, stimulating, rewarding, and aiding the progress of thought on these subjects. It ought to assist the State in the designs of public works and monuments, as the Royal Society assists the State on questions of public scientific interest. Of these various objects, the former, bearing on the personal interests and instruction of artists as a private corporation, have to a certain extent been pursued and attained by the present Royal Academy: it is, perhaps, no reflection on that body to say that, constituted as it now is, it has never sought to extend its sphere of action. Its structure is that of a private society, but it is lodged by the nation, and great public services are expected of it. Less has been done in England than in any other European country to foster the arts by the direct patronage of the State: the greater has been the need of an independent society of artists, capable of perpetuating the honourable traditions of the British school, and of rendering those services to the culture of the Fine Arts, which, down to a very recent period, were so singularly neglected by the Government.

The first design of founding an Academy of Art in England may be traced back to King Charles I., who granted a patent in 1636 to what he termed his *Museum Minerva*—probably on the suggestion of Rubens and of Gerbier, who had made the King acquainted with the results of that great school of Antwerp which threw lustre over his own reign. But the civil wars put an end to the undertaking. It was resumed soon after the Restoration by John Evelyn, who has left in his 'Sculptura' the scheme of a projected Academy, resembling in many points that which was adopted one hundred years later. Professors were to be appointed; 'living models provided to

‘stand five nights in the week;’ ‘each Professor was to present the Academy with a piece of his performance at admission;’ graduated schools were to be established, medals to be given, and a provision made for sending the Fellows to Rome to complete their studies. Art schools were also to be founded, with drawing masters appointed under the seal of the Academy, to instruct students in ornamental designs, ‘which are of great use in our manufactures.’ Had the judicious plan of Evelyn been adopted, the Royal Academy would have been coeval with the Royal Society, and might have done for art as much as that learned body has done for science. In the early part of the following century some attempts were made by Sir Godfrey Kneller and Sir James Thornhill to establish private schools, but with small success. In 1755, another spontaneous effort was made by the artists to found an Academy, and the Committee endeavoured to place the plan under the patronage of the Society of Dilettanti by proposing that the President of the Royal Academy should be annually chosen from that body: the Dilettanti, however, declined the compliment, and the scheme was abandoned. Meanwhile, however, the Society of Arts (which still flourishes at the Adelphi) had come into existence: and it was there that the first exhibition of British painters took place in 1760. No less than 6,582 catalogues were sold, and the artists bought 100*l.* stock out of the proceeds of the exhibition. The King was soon afterwards solicited to incorporate by royal charter the ‘Society of Artists;’ and the roll of the association was signed by no less than 211 professional candidates. Some discord, however, ensued, which was terminated by a declaration of the King that he considered the culture of the arts as a national concern, and should, therefore, take the nascent Academy under his especial protection. Sir Joshua Reynolds, who had hitherto stood aloof, and was no favourite at Court, was unanimously hailed ‘President’ by his brother artists; and on December 10, 1768, the King signed that ‘Instrument,’ which has remained to this day the basis of the constitution of the Royal Academy. Its character and provisions (which are said to have been prepared by Lord Camden) are peculiar; for it has none of the distinctive features of a public charter, and it may be difficult to determine what is its legal character. It is under no seal; it is not countersigned by any Minister; George III. ratified it by simply adding these words to the proposed regulations:—

‘I approve of this plan; let it be put in execution.

‘GEORGE R.’



The existing Academy has no other constitution ; and although it seems that the present law officers of the Crown (consulted by the Royal Commissioners) have given an opinion of its sufficiency for the protection of the funds of the Society, it is clear that a body thus constituted retains more of a private than a public character. One of the objects of the Royal Commission has been to put an end to this anomalous condition ; and in this they have acted upon the opinion of the President of the Academy itself, and of several of its most eminent members. Sir Charles Eastlake stated, in answer to Question 797. :—

‘The management of the affairs of the institution has been hitherto understood to be uncontrolled, except by the will of the Sovereign, and the Academy, I think, have some ground for stipulating that that understanding should continue. I repeat that they are quite amenable to the Government and the House of Commons for the management of their affairs, and they would rather desire than shrink from such inquiries as the present.

‘798. (*Mr. Reeve.*)—I observe that you rest the case which you have just laid before the Commission on what you very properly call an understanding. Do you not think that the independence and the interests of the Royal Academy would be more effectually protected by a more precise definition of its true position?—I quite agree with that view.

‘799. Do you not think that to obtain a more precise definition of its true position in relation both to the Crown and the public, it might be expedient (perhaps as the result of this inquiry) to substitute for the vague instrument of 1768 a Royal Charter in which the interests and rights of the Academy should be fully considered, in short, to revise the deed of foundation in that way, and to give it a more formal character?—It would be very desirable to consider that point carefully. Certainly a clear understanding, such as you suggest, in some form or other, would be most desirable.

‘800. (*Mr. Seymour.*)—You stated in your former examination that the Academy was a national institution?—Yes, inasmuch as its objects are national.

‘801. Only inasmuch as its objects are national?—The mode in which it is supported is not national, it is in that sense private, it would be absolutely national if it were supported by the State.

‘802. You only meant by calling it a national institution that it was instituted for the public good?—Undoubtedly. Any strictly private society would not be debarred from dividing amongst its members the profits of an exhibition, and the Academy very properly consider that they have a duty to perform to the public. In that sense they are a public and national body.

‘803. Do you know whether the instrument which the Academy accepted in 1768 would have any weight in determining their position in a court of law, as to whether they were a private or a public society?—No. That is a question rather for this Commission to

determine, but I should imagine that the very fact of their being self-supported coincides with the view of those who consider them a private society. But their most important functions are undoubtedly public and national in their objects; and it may be fair to express the opinion that the fact of their attending to those national objects, independently of the Government, is to the praise of the Academy.

'804. If the Academy took a charter, that would make it a public body?—Yes, in a certain sense.

'805. But at present some maintain that it is a private body with the Sovereign merely as its patron?—From the reasons which I have already stated that is hardly a fair view, because its objects are nationally useful.'

This brings us to the consideration of what the Royal Academy has done and what are its deserts; and on these grounds we assert with confidence that its services and merits have been strangely underrated by the public. In the first place, in the whole course of its existence it has not received one penny of the public money. George III. undertook to meet any pecuniary deficiencies which might occur, and in the earlier years of the institution about 5,000*l.* were paid to it as a donation from the King's privy purse. The King also assigned to the Academy rooms in Somerset House, which had recently been exchanged for Buckingham House, and had become public property. These rooms, to which it is admitted that the Academy have a moral though not a legal claim, were afterwards exchanged for a portion of the building erected in Trafalgar Square. Beyond this, the Academy owes everything it possesses, and everything it has done, to the proceeds of its own exhibitions, augmented by benefactions from one or two of its own members. Whatever, therefore, the shortcomings of the Academy may be in other respects, it cannot be denied that the financial management of its affairs has been most creditable. It appears from the general abstract of the accounts of the Academy from 1769 to 1859, annexed to the Report of the Council for 1860, that the total sums received from the exhibitions of these ninety years have amounted (deducting expenses) to 267,583*l.* 15*s.* 5*d.*; to this must be added for interest on accumulations of stock 96,683*l.* 10*s.* 9*d.* Out of these receipts the Academy has expended 218,469*l.* 5*s.* 0*d.* on the gratuitous instruction of students and in the general management of the institution; it has also spent 61,511*l.* 6*s.* 5*d.* in pensions and assistance to distressed or superannuated artists and their families; and it held in 1860 a balance of 104,499*l.* 19*s.* 8*d.* (including 20,000*l.* from the Turner Fund). This sum has since been considerably increased, and now amounts to about 141,382*l.* 6*s.* 1*d.* three per cent. stock. The average income of

the Academy exceeds 10,000*l.* a year; the annual expenditure on the schools and general outlay of the institution from 1853 to 1859 averaged 6,135*l.* 6*s.* 4*d.*; the expenditure on pensions and donations averaged 1,209*l.* 8*s.* 8*d.*; so that the Academy increased its revenue fund in the same period by savings to the amount of 3,239*l.* 9*s.* 0*d.* a year.

It must be observed that the whole of this large sum is the result of the public exhibition of the works of artists; and in this respect the Academy of England differs essentially from all similar institutions abroad. They are all more or less pensioners of the State; they have, as in France, no control over the exhibition of modern works of art, or they derive no profit from that source; but in the same degree they lose that independence which is the glory of an English community. Every artist, be he an Academician or not, who exhibits a work of merit in the rooms allotted to the Academy contributes to this fund; he may derive fame from it; he may sell it to advantage; but the specific profit to be derived from the exhibition of his work he gives to the Academy. This profit may be, and is in some cases, very large—as much as 4,000*l.* has been realised in one year by the exhibition of a single picture in Britain. Had that picture been sent to the Academy, the artist would have ceded to that body whatever profit might accrue from inviting the public to view his work.\* The funds of the Academy are the accumulation of profits derived from this source.

In return, it must be added, that although the Academy has it in its power to confer distinction and to enhance reputation when it is deserved, yet the artist has nothing whatever to expect from it in the nature of pecuniary advantages, unless, indeed, he falls into indigence. Even the officers of the

---

\* For example, Mr. Frith's popular picture of the 'Derby Day' was exhibited at the Royal Academy; Mr. Frith's not less popular picture of the 'Railway Station' has been privately and separately exhibited in London and elsewhere. A very large sum has doubtless been realised by this private exhibition: in the case of the former picture, this profit was virtually ceded by the artist to the Academy.

Take again the case of the exhibitions of the two societies of water-colour painters. They are private property. Hence the advantage of exhibiting there is limited to the actual members of these societies, and the proceeds of these exhibitions are the property of the exhibitors. It is for this reason that the leading water-colour painters are by no means disposed to transfer their works from the private rooms of their own societies to the public galleries of the Royal Academy, which bring no direct emolument to the exhibiting artist.

Academy are miserably paid. The fee to one of the first painters or sculptors in the country as Visitor in the schools is *a guinea* for two hours' work; the President receives a modicum of 300*l.* a year. The large accumulated funds of the Royal Academy, then, represent personal sacrifices made by the artists of England for nearly a century to the common stock of their craft; and it is highly to their honour that such a fund should have been so accumulated by their independent exertions, to be devoted to no private objects but to the advancement of art and the maintenance of their Society in dignity and independence.

Perhaps, indeed, this desire to increase the common stock has been carried too far. Greater liberality would have produced better schools, better teachers, and more conspicuous results. An Academy of Art does not exist for the purpose of laying by so many thousands a year.

To this the Academy replies:—Our tenure is uncertain. We have frequently been reminded that we hold our apartments on something like sufferance. It is possible that we may have to provide a building for ourselves. We have prepared for that contingency; but from the moment that Parliament will relieve us from this apprehension, by the permanent provision of an edifice suited to our wants (which the portion of the building now assigned to us is not), we desire no better than liberally to spend our whole income in the promotion and encouragement of the arts.

From this state of facts two obvious inferences may be drawn. It is greatly for the interest of the arts and of the public not to allow this fund to be broken up for mere building purposes, but to respect it as the self-earned endowment of a magnificent corporation; but it is the duty and the right of the State, in making a suitable provision for the abode of the Royal Academy, with its schools and its exhibitions, to impose such conditions as may be best adapted to secure and perpetuate its national character, and to make it the centre and representative of the arts of this country. To these purposes the members of the Academy have declared that they are ready to devote their funds, as was contemplated by their founder; and to these purposes, under a good administration, they would be devoted.

Thus far we have had in view the golden side of the shield; but it is not denied by the most zealous friends of the Academy, that with all these advantages, and with the prestige arising from a prosperous and glorious existence of nearly a century, the Royal Academy is very far below the standard to which its accomplished President, its most eminent members, and the public at large would wish to raise it. The evidence of the

Academicians themselves taken, in no unfriendly spirit, by the Royal Commission, and now published with the Report, demonstrates, beyond the possibility of doubt, that most serious defects exist in the constitution and management of the whole body. At the head of all these *gravamina* stands the incurable evil of all self-elected bodies, that they are jealous of all participation in their power, yet timid and reluctant to use it themselves. Various enlightened attempts at reform made by the President, and seconded by such men as Cope, Roberts, Maclise, and Westmacott, have fallen to the ground before the inertia of the general assembly. Petty and personal motives have, it is obvious, been allowed too often to prevail over a broad and spirited conception of the duties and interests of Art. It may be true that there are very few instances in which artists of a high rank have been deliberately excluded from the Academy; and indeed it is the obvious interest of the Academy to incorporate with itself every man who has earned a large share of the public favour. Haydon and Martin are the most conspicuous examples of these unfortunate omissions in former times; in our own, Linnell and Watts. But this apparent exclusion is mainly due to a pedantic adherence to forms, which tend to repel rather than to attract some of the most desirable candidates.

The state of the schools is frankly admitted to be lamentable. They are, in fact, but little frequented, in spite of the attraction of gratuitous instruction and very accomplished Visitors. Mr. Maclise stated that 'he never saw such a bad set of drawings and other studies as were placed before us last year' (A. 1450.). Mr. Westmacott admitted that 'the schools are badly attended, and that the teaching of the schools is very inferior.' Sir Edwin Landseer desired more attention to anatomical study; and there is ample testimony to the same effect. The system of Visitors has been much canvassed, and the weight of opinion seems to preponderate in favour of a well-paid permanent Director of the schools. But what is certain is, that the present Keeper (who teaches in the Antique school) has allowed the standard of instruction to sink to the lowest level; and that the other Professors of the Academy (with the exception of Mr. Partridge, who is not a painter or an Academician, but an anatomist) have utterly failed to give life and energy to the students. The Academy has now to compete with schools of design in all parts of the country. These schools of design afford easy and effectual means of mastering the rudiments of the art; they do not, however, pretend to form artists. The Royal Academy ought to take up

the most promising of these students where the schools of design leave them, and by affording more liberal encouragement and a higher class of instruction, complete their education, as far as the education of an artist can be completed, for as Sir Edward Landseer answered, 'We are students all our lives; when I have been in the Life academy, I have always drawn like the other students. Students teach themselves. You cannot teach a man beyond giving him a preliminary education.'

Since the completion of the Commissioners' inquiry the Academy has sustained an irreparable loss by the death of Mr. Mulready, who was the most constant and able of all the Visitors in the schools, and has not as a master of the art of drawing left his equal behind him. His single-hearted, genial nature, joined to a profound knowledge and feeling of the principles of his art, may be traced in the evidence he gave before the Commission. For sixty-two years, boy and man, he had laboured in and for the Academy, for he entered its walls as a student with the century; and the English schools have never had a more devoted or honourable representative than William Mulready. The following answer is striking and characteristic. When asked by Lord Hardinge whether he had

'Any suggestions to make for the improvement of the schools, or do you think them in so satisfactory a state as to be incapable of improvement?—I have none to make here. I have a very strong sense of obligation to the Academy, having received my education there, and having the Academy alone almost to thank for my education in Art. The obligation which I have signed to support the honour of the Academy, as long as I remain a member of it, is never forgotten by me, and I think the proper place for suggesting improvements in the Academy is as an Academician in my place there. It is not that I would hesitate a moment in answering a direct question upon any point, but I would decidedly prefer doing my duty there in stating what I might consider an improvement to stating it here, if you will forgive me for saying so. I think it my duty constantly to think what would benefit the Academy, not to forget anything that would seem to amend it, even in a point in which I might think it perfect, to consider it again and again, and let the Academy have the benefit of my opinion upon it.'

In rewards to students the Academy has done less than is desirable. Only twenty-three travelling studentships have been granted in the whole duration of the school, and no pecuniary assistance is afforded to promising students at home: it is evident that purses, or temporary annuities, to young men engaged in the study of Art would be the most useful form of assistance and encouragement to those who have shown themselves capable of great progress.

The unpopularity of the Royal Academy amongst the great bulk of those artists who do not belong to it, and amongst some of those who do belong to it, is attributed by Sir Charles Eastlake mainly to the invidious duty of selection which the Academy is compelled to discharge. They select candidates for the honours of the profession; they select pictures for exhibition; and it follows that the rejected class abuses those by whom they suppose themselves to suffer: this recrimination influences the press, and, through the press, the public. We cannot wholly agree with the amiable President. Men in office are every day called upon to select candidates for honours and for place, and to reject many more than they can select: the question is whether their motives are clear and above suspicion, and whether the result is ratified by the enlightened opinion of the country. The Academy would have nothing whatever to fear from the rancour of disappointed candidates, if those candidates were not sometimes of far higher account in Art than some of the men who enjoy and confer its honours.

On the score of the arrangement of the Exhibition, the Academy has been frequently denounced—we think, unjustly. The inquiry before the Royal Commission proves that the whole Council take so active a part in these arrangements, that it would be almost impossible for any wilful act of favouritism or malice to pass unnoticed; and we cannot assent to the delusion of one dissatisfied witness who conceived that the whole Academy were conspiring ‘to prevent him from getting on too fast.’ The real grievance of the Exhibition is the want of space in the present building, which causes some pictures of merit to be returned and many more to be ill-hung.\* We do not desire to see the Exhibition enlarged by the admission of more inferior works; quite the reverse; but in a suitable edifice the pictures ought to be displayed to far greater advantage. The privileges of members of the Academy to send their pictures as of right, and to occupy the best places, are invidious

---

\* It appears from Appendix II. annexed to the Report of the Commission, that the total number of works of art of all kinds sent in for exhibition varies from 2,000 to 2,500, of which about 1150 are placed; the remainder are sent back, either because they are ‘crossed’ (that is rejected), or because no suitable space can be found for them in the rooms. One feels compassion for this hecatomb of rejected works—each the child of imagination and of hope; yet we doubt not that with few exceptions they deserve their fate, and the experiment of an exhibition of rejected pictures, which was tried this year in Paris by order of the Emperor Napoleon, was a severer punishment than rejection to the disappointed artists.

and useless, for if their works are really of the highest quality they must of course command the best places; the privilege of the 'line,' therefore, only serves to render more conspicuous some painful example of academic mediocrity. This punctilio of the 'line' is, however, inherent in Academies. Gainsborough himself ceased to exhibit after 1784, because in that year one of his full-length portraits was not hung so low as he desired.

In this statement of grievances charged against the Academy, its sins of omission seem to weigh more heavily than its sins of commission. We entirely discredit the absurd imputations of base and interested motives which have sometimes been attributed to it. But we think that it ought to have done far more for the arts than it has yet attempted to effect; and if it had performed these public duties with greater energy, it would in return have enjoyed a much larger share of public confidence and esteem. To use the forcible expression of our excellent David Roberts, 'I think we are in such a sleepy state, that it 'would be desirable to have recourse to anything to awake us.' (A. 1191.)

The duty imposed upon the Royal Commission by Her Majesty's warrant was, amongst other things, to suggest such measures as may be required to render the Academy more useful in promoting art and in improving and developing public taste. Without further recrimination as to the past, we shall now follow the Commissioners over this portion of their labours.

It is obvious that the root of the whole matter lies in the constitution and government of the Royal Academy itself. Suggestions of detail may no doubt be made, and some of them are made in this Report, for the improvement of the schools and of the Exhibition: but if the body charged with the administration of the affairs of the Academy were all that could be desired, these reforms would follow as a matter of course. Here, as elsewhere, the organic question of the form and election of government comprehends everything else.

The whole executive power of the Academy is now vested by the 'instrument' of George III. in a Council of eight Academicians, to whom are added the President and Secretary. This Council is formed by simple rotation, four members going out every year, and being succeeded by the four next in turn. A new Academician is, however, always placed at once on the Council to learn his business. It is evident that this system prevents the selection of those members of the body who are best qualified to conduct its affairs, and in truth reduces the composition of the executive power to an accident.



As the vacancies in the rank of Academician are rare—about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  per annum in the last twenty years—and the competitors numerous, it seldom happens that an artist attains the highest object of professional ambition before middle life, when his reputation is made, but when the fire and energy of his best years is already somewhat exhausted. As he retains the honour and position for life, it necessarily follows that a large proportion of the Academicians, in whom alone all power is vested, are men in the declining period of their career. At the commencement of this year, ten of the Royal Academicians were born in the last century—eight were above 70 years of age; the last painter elected was 61, the last sculptor 54; the youngest Academician is 43. Our Academicians are as old as our admirals and our generals were before the Crimean war, and for the same reason: promotion by seniority is slow; and when men reach the highest step, they are no longer so competent to perform its duties as they would have been ten or even twenty years earlier. It is as true of art as of war, that nothing can be more injurious than to throw the chief direction of it into the hands of old men, and to exclude those artists who are in the prime of life and in the full vigour of productive power. This we hold to be the true cause of the unpopularity and want of energy of the Academy; inside its walls, you have a Council of veterans, who have accomplished their task and secured their own position; outside, you have the whole mass of young, eager, aspiring artists, who are excluded by the present constitution from having any voice in the conduct of its affairs, although it is their contributions to the Exhibition which chiefly give novelty, life, and interest to its annual display. If the Exhibition were limited for a single year to the works of the Academicians themselves, it would find itself exposed to a very formidable competition by the works of those whom it has not yet admitted to any participation in its affairs. Nothing can be more undesirable, in the true interest of art and artists, than to keep up this severance between the elder and the younger members of the profession; everything ought, on the contrary, to be done to unite them. To whom does the public look, at the present time, for the chief interest of the Exhibition? To Millais, Cooke, Ansell, Sidney Cooper, Faed, O'Neil, Richmond—every one of these are Associates; or, again, to Calderon, Holman Hunt, Leighton, Watts, W. G. Wall, the Linnells, Maccallum, Jutsum, Martineau, and many others—but these are not even Associates. In sculpture it is still worse. Behnes, Bell, Macdonald, Munro, Noble, Theed, Mr. and Mrs. Thornycroft, and Woolner, are all

*outside* the Academy. How can an Academy perform its duties to Art and to the Public when many of the most rising members of the profession do not belong to it, and those who do belong to it are elderly men, who have long ago obtained the rewards to which they were justly entitled?

The class of Associates was doubtless added to the Academy by George III., to include the junior class of artists; but the manner in which this was done defeated the object and produced dissatisfaction and ill-blood. Twenty Associates were added, consisting of course of younger men, from whom the Academicians are chosen; and as an artist rarely remains for life in the subordinate rank, the promotion is more rapid than in the higher grade. Since the foundation of the Academy in 1768, there have been but 156 R.A.'s, including those now living; but there have been 194 A.R.A.'s, although the number at any given time is but half as large. But these Associates are mere expectant Academicians. They have but a small share in the privileges of the body. They have no votes in the election of members, or in the General Assembly. They are not represented in the arrangement of the Exhibition, to which they frequently contribute the finest performances. Yet they are afraid to make their grievances known, because their advancement to the higher rank depends on the good pleasure of their superiors; and a grumbling artist runs a good chance of remaining at the side-table of the Associates for life.

This is the master-abuse to which the Royal Commissioners appear to have directed their attention, when they agreed to recommend that the class of Associates should not be abolished or reduced, as had been recommended by some witnesses, but enlarged at once to fifty, with power to make a still further increase, for the purpose 'of introducing a large amount of youthful talent into the Academy, of connecting that institution more thoroughly than is the case at present with the whole body of artists beyond its walls.' (*Report*, p. 10.) These Associates would, conjointly with the Academicians themselves, form a General Assembly of about 100 members, a number sufficient to include at the present time all the artists in this country who have established a claim to such a distinction; and every member of this body would enjoy the privilege of a vote. This General Assembly of the whole Academy would meet at least twice a year, for the purpose of electing to vacancies and approving the acts of the Council; and as the Commission recommend that all voting on elections should be open, and not, as heretofore, by ballot, the choice of candidates would rest on the ground of acknowledged merit,

rather than on that of seniority or preference. This important change would put an end to the invidious position in which the Associates now stand. It would give them a fair share of power in the management of the whole body, and it would combine the voices and opinions of the rising members of the profession with those of its most experienced chiefs.

The list of the existing members of the Academy which is to be found in Appendix IV. of the Report, shows that the Painters have encroached to a considerable extent on the sister arts and on the design of George III. The reason given is that painters supply by far the most attractive and lucrative portion of the annual Exhibition; and to some extent this is true. There are at this time in the Academy but four Academicians and one Associate sculptors, and three architects. The original selection made by George III. was far more liberally varied. The King's list contained but twenty-four painters against five sculptors and six architects; and of these members two, Angelica Kauffmann and Mary Moser, were women; Cipriani, Bartolozzi, Carlini, Zoffany, Dominic Serres, and Zuccarelli were foreigners. It also included Moser, the gold-chaser, as one of the original members, to whom we owe the exquisite snuff-boxes and watch-cases of the last century; a proof that the Academy was intended to embrace whatever was excellent in art. It is discreditable that men like Pistrucci, who was the first, we might say the only real, gem engraver of his age, and Vechte, of matchless excellence in gold and silver chasing, should have obtained no honours, and no recognition whatever, from the Academy. On every account we are convinced that greater breadth of choice is to be desired. The professors of one art living much together, and constantly looking to the same object, fall into the monotony of a caste. They need in the highest degree the action of other minds upon their own. It is this isolation in professional life which inters so many accomplished fellows of colleges in cloisters, and so many acute lawyers in their chambers. The pretension of some of the artists that they alone are qualified to judge of the merit of each other's works—that they alone possess anything of the real traditions of Art—is, we say it with deference, an unfortunate delusion. Artists paint, not for themselves, or for one another, but for the public; and their fate would be deplorable if the public taste were not sufficiently educated to appreciate what is good in their works. Whatever the taste of the public may be, they are compelled to adapt themselves to it; and that is their best excuse at the present day for a large class of productions, which, though not entirely devoid of merit, have little

claim to an exalted position in Art. It would be absurd to dispute that a man who paints has more practical knowledge of the art of painting than a man who does not. But these technical acquirements are widely distinct from a true knowledge of Art. The late Mr. Phillips used to relate that, on finding himself in presence of Titian's 'Peter Martyr' at Venice, with a brother Academician, that distinguished person turned to him, after a long pause of admiration, with the remark, 'How wonderfully those fellows ground their colours!'

Mr. Cope remarked, in his evidence before the Royal Commission —

'An artist, when he exhibits in the Academy, does not exhibit to please its members, but to please some part of the public outside, and in that way his works are influenced. The majority of pictures on commission now are painted for merchants in Lancashire. They like a particular class of Art, and they select the painter whom they most approve of, and with whose works they have the greatest sympathy; but it does not follow that therefore they would be fit to be lay members of the Academy because they encourage Art, and are very much interested in Art.

'1799. Your objection to this non-professional element, so far as the election of artists goes, rests upon the fact that commissions are given for special paintings upon special subjects. There are many works on the walls of the Academy which have been so specially commissioned. There is no such thing, is there, as catholicity of Art on the part of painters or of the patrons of Art; that is to say, it is seldom that works are painted or ordered without having a reference to some special technical detail either of subject or of treatment?—Very seldom indeed.

'1800. Do you think that a healthy state of Art?—No; but I think that it is owing to a want of employment of a higher order of subjects, such as the decoration of churches or other public buildings. The Italians were all influenced by high feeling; in fact they were considered, and they considered themselves, as in some degree spreading religion. That it is which promotes High Art. At present there is nothing of the sort; but the Academy is not to blame for that.'

But Mr. Cope appears in these answers to confound the vulgar patronage of monied men, whose taste is more likely to lower than to raise the practice of the arts, with the just co-operation of enlightened and discriminating criticism. It is the greatest misfortune for the arts that they should be too dependent on men of long purses and neglected minds. No one dreams of placing any such men in the Academy at all. The 'catholicity' here spoken of is the result of the free and liberal interchange of thought, not of painting commissions for Lancashire tradesmen. Moreover, that class of purchasers will

buy what they are led to believe on higher authority to be excellent and valuable. Nothing, a few years ago, was more inscrutable to them than the works of Turner; yet they will now give any price for a Turner drawing. In a word, they have been educated up to the higher level.

We shall venture to go one step further. We will even assert that the services rendered to Art by enlightened criticism deserve to stand immediately after the services rendered by creative genius itself. To the knowledge and feeling of Art in this country Sir Joshua Reynolds's immortal Discourses have, perhaps, contributed even more than Sir Joshua Reynolds's paintings; and it is certain that they will remain, eternally fresh and true, when all the finest touches of his pencil have faded into night. It was fortunate that Sir Joshua was a painter; it was fortunate that he presided over the birth of the Royal Academy; but the merit of his literary services to Art is not indissolubly connected with his performances as an artist.

There is some proof that Sir Joshua himself, with the wisdom of an enlarged and well-stored mind, felt that the youthful Academy would be incomplete if it did not include some representatives of the class of thinkers, writers, orators, and historians, who are not less essential to perfection in the arts than painters and sculptors. Hence he prevailed on the King to include in the Academy a class of honorary members, under the title of Professors. These titles have been conferred on men who did honour to the Academy by accepting them. In history, Gibbon, Mitford, Hallam, Grote, and Milman; in letters, Goldsmith, Johnson, Sir Walter Scott, Lord Macaulay, and Lord Stanhope—we name only the most illustrious. But, most unfortunately, these officers have borne no part whatever in the business of the Academy. They were never asked to read a lecture. They were never allowed to register a vote. The most eloquent of prelates is the Academy chaplain—but he is only allowed to say grace once a year after dinner.

This is a *reductio ad absurdum* of such honorary memberships; and it is impossible not to feel that if men of this high cultivation and distinction could be induced to take some part in the affairs of the Academy, it would tend to give it something more of that enlarged influence on the public taste which it does not possess. They would not of course paint pictures or exhibit statues; between them and their professional colleagues no rivalry could exist. But they would feel, perhaps more than the painters themselves, that there are things to be done for the encouragement and improvement of Art of even greater

moment than the exhibition of paintings or the supervision of schools.

This lay influence has, indeed, been exercised ever since the foundation of the Academy by one eminent person, with great and paramount authority; and to the direct intervention of this lay authority the Academicians themselves rightly attach great value. The eminent person who enjoys this distinction and exercises this power is the Sovereign for the time being: within the walls of the Academy the pleasure of the King or Queen who fills the throne is well-nigh absolute. It may happen—it has happened—that, as in the case of Her Majesty, especially when aided by the Prince whose loss, grievous on all accounts, was especially grievous to the arts, the Sovereign may possess considerable knowledge and a correct taste in Art. But that is a happy accident. The Royal Academicians will hardly carry their loyalty to the length of applauding George IV. for his taste in architecture, or William IV. for his knowledge of painting. Yet these princes exercised during their reigns a degree of power over the Academy which was wholly denied to the most accomplished men in the kingdom, enjoying the titular distinction of honorary membership.

The selection of the Royal Commission by which these inquiries have recently been carried on, with the assistance of the leading members of the Academy, may be quoted as another example of this principle. It was not composed of artists; it was not composed of men in political office; it consisted simply of half a dozen gentlemen, well-known for an intelligent interest in the welfare of artists and the progress of Art. Yet it does not appear to have occurred to any artist to suggest that they were wholly incompetent to deal with the subject. The late Fine Arts Commission, presided over by the Prince Consort, was entirely composed of noblemen and gentlemen known for their enlightened sympathy with the arts. They had the President of the Royal Academy for their Secretary. To this Commission artists owe the most important efforts which have been made in England to revive a great historical school of painting. In like manner, the Commissions named to judge of the Cartoon Exhibition in Westminster Hall, and of the designs for some great public buildings, have been wisely composed partly of artists and partly of the patrons and judges of Art.

The admixture of a small proportion of the non-professional element in the councils of professional men has been tried with success in several other instances. No profession is more exclusive than that of military engineering; yet Mr. Fergusson

has sat upon the Defence and Fortification Commissions with advantage. The practice of medicine is strictly confined to its own graduates; yet in the medical committees of the London University laymen have been introduced, and provision has been made by Parliament for the admission of laymen to the General Medical Council. On naming the Select Commission of the House of Commons on the Transfer of Land, it was thought essential that the lawyers should not be left to deal exclusively with the mysteries of conveyancing. Even in Convocation, if ever a reform be attempted, it is obvious that the first step will be the admission of lay representatives. Every profession weakens itself when it sets up a pretension to be regarded as a caste, and to entrench itself in its own irresponsibility. We all, in our several pursuits, are subject to the control and judgment of the public; and it is the interest of every corporation to connect itself with the representatives of enlightened public opinion.

For example, no provision whatever has been made in the Academy for the connexion between the arts and science. Yet that connexion is real, essential, and direct. The whole mystery of colour is only to be solved by chemistry and optics. The composition of colours is of such moment, that it has been well suggested that a laboratory ought to be maintained by the Academy for the express purpose of making experiments on this subject; and lectures of great utility to painters might be given by a distinguished man of science, who, like Dr. Percy, has given his attention to the vehicles and pigments used in the arts. The following valuable communication was addressed by Dr. Percy to a member of the Royal Commission:—

‘The durability of colours is a matter of the highest interest, both to artists and the public; but it is one, nevertheless, which requires much more attention than it now receives. I think the Royal Academy should without further delay undertake an extensive series of experiments to determine conclusively what colours are permanent and what are fugitive.

‘In the course of a few years, or possibly less, reliable information would be accumulated of *inestimable* practical value. The record of the observations should be accessible to all artists, and it might be desirable to publish the results for general circulation. I have often talked this scheme over with many Academicians, and they have invariably expressed their approval of it. I have more than once been on the point of addressing a communication to the President of the Royal Academy to urge this proposal. Had our artists been in possession of facts such as would thereby be accumulated, we should not have to deplore the sad changes which have taken place in many important paintings.

‘It would obviously be desirable that instruction should be conveyed by lectures, or otherwise, to artists, concerning the nature and composition of pigments. The lectures should be copiously illustrated by experimental demonstration, such as a chemical lecturer presents.’

What could be more useful than to have a man of science, conversant with these matters, in the Council of the Academy?

The Academy, as it is now constituted, has not arrived at anything higher than an elementary school of design and painting, and its influence in this school is confined to a very limited number of admitted students. The Discourses of Sir Joshua Reynolds were delivered not as lectures, but on the distribution of prizes at the anniversary of the foundation on the 10th December. This excellent practice has fallen into desuetude, and was finally abandoned by Sir Martin Shee. The lectures of the Professors have degenerated into a monotonous repetition of a few written papers, utterly without interest to the students and the public. Yet what a field is open to men who are called upon to lecture on the whole range of Art, in connexion with history, biography, and literature, as well as in the stricter sphere of criticism! And if such lectures were delivered at the Academy by men of the first ability, and thrown open on easy terms to the public, would they be less attractive than the lectures of the Royal Institution or of other public bodies? On the contrary, it rests with the Council of the Academy to assume the rank and position of a University of Art. The following answers of Mr. Redgrave, himself at once a Royal Academician and the Director of the Government Schools of Design at South Kensington, show that a large portion of these functions of an Academy of Art has been assumed by the Government at a very large expense to the public:—

‘1079. (*Mr. Reeve.*) Do any students of the South Kensington Schools attend the lectures of the Academy?—Some few, not many.

‘1080. Are any lectures on subjects connected with Art given in your schools at South Kensington?—Yes, we have had various lectures; we have always lectures on anatomy going on; we have lectures, and usually more art lectures than they have at the Royal Academy.

‘1081. Are they well attended?—Very well attended; our students know that they must attend them in order to pass at the examinations.

‘1082. Do you think that if lectures were given at the Royal Academy on subjects connected with Art, by men of talent and eminence, they could be rendered attractive to persons in the metropolis taking an interest in Art?—I should hope so. My own feeling



is, that those lectures should not be given to the students of Art only, but that they should be given to everybody appreciating them.

'1083. Do you not think that it would raise the character and increase the utility of the Academy if it were known that it was an institution in which lectures of that character were to be heard?—I think it would, and I think that it is almost the duty of the Royal Academy to instruct the general public in Art as well as its own students.

'1084. The South Kensington Schools of Design are connected with the Committee of the Privy Council, which manages the funds devoted to educational purposes?—Yes.

'1085. What amount of public money does the Committee of Council on Education appropriate to the objects of the Schools of Design?—In the last year they appropriated about 38,550*l.*, but I should add that that includes every outlay connected with 90 schools, and about 90,000 pupils, and all the objects bought for the South Kensington Museum; thus it will be found that our students cost the Government about 8*s.* 8*d.* per head per annum.

'1086. In fact, the money appropriated to those purposes by the Government is not confined to the purpose of Art instruction?—Not merely to teaching the executive of Art.

'1087. It is difficult, is it not, to say how much goes to purposes of instruction in Art?—Our instruction in Art is not considered to consist wholly in the teaching of painting, drawing, and modelling, but also instruction in ornament as applied to manufactures; therefore we consider the museum a part of our instruction in Art; that circulates through the whole kingdom. Part of our museum is always travelling through the kingdom. If new purchases are made they are sent to those schools to which they would be most useful. All the money spent upon objects of Art, upon Art instruction, upon prizes and rewards, and upon training masters, summed together, comes to 38,550*l.* for the past year.

'1088. (*Mr. Seymour.*) Out of that how much is spent on the museum?—About 12,000*l.* or 13,000*l.*

We have very great doubts whether it is expedient that a department of Government should thus be called upon to interfere with a particular branch of the public education, and we think it is to be regretted that any portion of the National collections of art are placed, as they are at South Kensington, at the mercy of the Minister or Under-Secretary of the day. We had much rather see all that relates to the arts in the hands of persons selected for no political motive, but really qualified to deal with the subject, and chosen by those whom it concerns. But this intervention of the Government is doubtless the result of the supineness of the Royal Academy.

It must be admitted that the suggestion put by the Royal Commissioners to the witnesses in favour of the admission of a non-professional element to the Academy, was met with dis-

approval by many eminent artists; although, on the other hand, it was gladly accepted by others. We question whether the Academicians fully realised the nature of the project. They have accustomed themselves to look upon the Academy almost entirely as an institution for carrying on an annual exhibition of paintings, and for managing a small school of artists. In these two objects, it is evident that non-professional men would have little reason to intervene. But the whole question at issue between the Academy and the public is, whether a great national institution has no other and higher objects than these. We think it has. We think it might render the greatest services by seeking to counteract the effects of the vulgar patronage of the monied classes, and by giving a higher impulse to the exertions of our artists. It is in devising and promoting these objects, and not merely in the Exhibition or the schools, that the assistance of educated laymen might be valuable to the Academy. The proof that no such objects will be attained by the class of artists alone, is, that they have never even attempted to employ their ample resources both of funds and of talent in that direction.

There is, however, one point on which all the members of the Royal Academy and all its critics are agreed, and that is, that it is utterly impossible for the Society to carry on its operations upon the scale which is now required, within the narrow limits now assigned to it. Want of space is the plea urged against every proposal of reform, and not untruly. The schools are almost entirely closed for the five best months of the year, because the Exhibition occupies the halls and lecture-rooms. Sculpture has been driven from the Academy by the vile receptacle allotted to it. School of Architecture there is none, because there is no room for it. The diploma pictures of the Academicians, and some other fine works, cannot be seen by the public, for want of a gallery to hang them in. The Academy itself bears the blame of many things, which are the inevitable result of inadequate accommodation.

We are satisfied, from the evidence, that these averments are true, and we conceive, with the Royal Commissioners, that it would be a wise and just policy to deal liberally with the Academy on the question of space, by putting them in possession of a public building amply sufficient for all their wants; provided the Academy, on the other hand, frankly accepted the obligations and modifications which would attend so distinct a recognition of its public character. This is the spirit of the Report of the Royal Commission; and for this purpose it recommends that a Charter be granted to the Academy, that the

class of Associates be extended in number, and invested with actual power in the corporation, and that ten non-professional men be added to the body by the choice of the Academy itself. These are the principal changes suggested, and on these terms we presume that the Government, if it think fit to adopt them, may engage in negotiation with the Academy.

In proposing to relinquish to the Academy the whole of the building in Trafalgar Square, it must be borne in mind that while it is perfectly adapted to the objects of the Academy, it is singularly ill-adapted for any other public purpose. In particular, it is ill-adapted for the purpose of a National Gallery. The site is so small (only about 11,500 square feet) that it is impossible to erect imposing galleries or halls upon it, without absorbing, at an enormous expense, the adjacent ground. The present building wants the very first condition of such an edifice—security; for it is declared by high authority to be in no degree fire-proof. Nor is the lighting by any means satisfactory. For all the purposes of a National Gallery the site of Burlington Gardens is quite equal, if not superior, to Trafalgar Square. It is equally central; and the space has no less than *eleven times* the area of the present building. Both the National Gallery and the Royal Academy urgently require this separation; and it is highly reasonable that the larger and more important site should be assigned to the great national collections of the old masters, to which we should gladly see united the strength of the English school.

This, then, is the point to which the questions now pending between the Royal Academy and the Government, on behalf of the public, have been brought by the labours of the late Commission. It is admitted on all hands that they call for a prompt and equitable solution. Supposing that the Government adopt the recommendations of the Commission, and make proposals to the Academy in conformity with them, it will be for the present members of the Academy to decide whether they will accept the offer of a public building, admirably suited to their wants, on the conditions suggested, viz., that they assume the character and responsibility of a public body, chartered by the Crown; that they accept a reform of their constitution; that they admit the junior members of their own profession to a share of power in the General Assembly; and that they also accept the participation of a small number of honorary members in their affairs. On the other hand, it will rest with Parliament to determine whether they will give effect to the plan, by providing funds for the erection of a National Gallery, on a new site, adapted to the importance of our present collections, and to their future extension.

We hope these subjects will be considered in the course of the recess, without party-spirit and without prejudice. There is but one rational object, common to all those who have taken a part in these discussions, namely, to do what is best for the advancement of the arts, for the welfare of artists, and for the honour of the country. The Royal Academy has a great opportunity of assuming a nobler and higher position among our national institutions than it has yet enjoyed. We hope that, acting under the enlightened advice of its President and its leading members, it will show itself equal to the occasion. For the alternative appears to us to be, that retaining its private character, it will renounce its public utility; other rival societies of artists will spring up; it will lose its hold on the profession and the public, and disappoint the expectation of its best friends. The choice is now before it; and we confidently await a favourable decision.

- ART. VII. -1. *Travels in Peru and India, while superintending the Collection of Chinchona Plants and Seeds in South America, and their Introduction into India.* By CLEMENTS R. MARKHAM, F.S.A., F.R.G.S. 1862.
2. *Notes on the Propagation and Cultivation of the Medical Chinchonas or Peruvian Bark Trees.* (Printed and published by order of the Government of Madras.) By WILLIAM GRAHAM M'IVOR. Madras: 1863.
3. *Two Letters from W. G. M'Ivor, Esq., to J. D. Sim, Esq., Secretary to Government.* Madras: 1863.
4. *Report on the Bark and Leaves of Chinchona Succiruba, grown in India.* By J. E. HOWARD, Esq. 1863.
5. *Memorandum on the Indigenous Cotton Plant of the Coast of Peru, and on the Proposed Introduction of its Cultivation into India.* By CLEMENTS R. MARKHAM, Esq. 1862.
6. *Memorandum by Dr. Wight on the Introduction of the Cotton Plants of the Peruvian Coast Valleys into the Madras Presidency.* 1862.

TO transplant a vegetable or a tree from the soil where it is indigenous to some other region fitted to receive it, is to extend the realm of Nature herself, and to produce by a very simple process incalculable results on the economy of the world. Agriculture, trade, fortune, food, population, health, may all be powerfully affected by the transfer of a little packet of seeds, or

by those modern contrivances known as 'Ward's cases,' which have so much facilitated the interchange of the vegetable productions of the globe. It is almost incredible how many of the commonest and most essential elements of daily life and daily food are due to the acclimatisation of plants in countries where they were once unknown; and how large a share human industry and enterprise have had in replenishing our forests, our gardens, and our hot-houses with 'grass, the herb yielding seed, and the tree yielding fruit, whose seed was in itself, after its kind.' It is hardly too much to say that successive æras in the history of our species might be traced by the wider diffusion of those plants which are most serviceable to the wants of man. And however little we may desire the intervention of governments in regulating the ordinary and natural course of trade, there can be no doubt that the introduction of new and useful plants to be employed in the industrial arts, for purposes of food, or for medicinal objects, is a most laudable use of the money and power of States. Without some such intervention it would have been totally impossible for Mr. Markham to accomplish the arduous task which he has described in the volume we have placed at the head of this paper; and assuredly the zeal, courage, and skill displayed by this gentleman in transplanting the Chinchona tree from the Peruvian Andes to the Highlands of India, entitle him to a distinguished place among the benefactors of mankind. The success of the experiment is now happily beyond question, and we owe to this enterprise the certainty that the supply of one of the most important remedies known to medicine is now placed under the protection of scientific culture and commercial interests, within the dependencies of the British Crown.

It is now more than two centuries since the invaluable febrifuge properties of a genus of plants indigenous to immense mountainous tracts of the South American continent, yet strictly limited to particular districts, were first made known to the physicians of Europe. That the virtues of the bark of certain species of Chinchona were known long before this period to the people of the districts in which they grew is, indeed, highly probable, whatever countenance may be given to a contrary opinion by the absence of this 'sovereign remedy' in the wallets of itinerant native doctors, who have plied 'their trade from father to son since the time of the Incas.' 'It seems probable,' says Mr. Markham, 'that the Indians were aware of the virtues of Peruvian bark in the neighbourhood of Loxa, 230 miles south of Quito, where its use was first made known to Europeans; and the Indian name for

'the tree, *Quina-quina*, "bark of bark," indicates that it was 'believed to possess special medicinal properties.' To what extent this knowledge may have prevailed it is impossible to say, and the discussion would be unprofitable; but the important fact of its introduction into Europe, its gradual appreciation by the physicians of that portion of the globe, and its consequent distribution over the whole civilised world, proving as it has done, one of the greatest boons ever bestowed upon man, deserve a more particular notice.

The name of Ana, Countess of Chinchon, is immortalised by its having been applied by the great author of systematic botany to this priceless genus of plants. This lady, the wife of the Count of Chinchon the Viceroy of Peru, was in 1638 attacked with fever at Lima. 'The corregidor of Loxa, Don Juan Lopez de Canizares, sent a parcel of powdered quinquina bark to her physician, Juan de Vega, assuring him that it was a sovereign and never-failing remedy for "tertiana." It was administered to the Countess and effected a complete cure.' Returning to Spain with her husband in 1640, and bringing with her a quantity of the healing bark, she was thus the first person to introduce this invaluable medicine into Europe. In memory of this great service Linnæus named the genus which yielded the remedy *Cinchona*; omitting the *h* from the first syllable, which, however, is now by common consent restored.

The districts where the trees grew which yielded the bark were for a long time comparatively little known to European geographers, and still less were botanists acquainted with the various species of *Chinchona* from which the new drug was procured. It was, however, a matter of urgent interest that a more accurate knowledge should be obtained of all the circumstances connected with a material of such growing importance. The attention of men of science no less than of commercial men was directed to these objects, and the botanists attached to various expeditions were charged with the duty of ascertaining the localities, characters, and properties of the different varieties of the now famous 'Peruvian bark.' The French expedition of 1735, the primary object of which was, however, rather geodetic than either botanical or commercial, possesses a double interest, inasmuch as to it we owe the first description of the 'quinquina' tree, and that the first attempt to transport plants of it to Europe was made by De la Condamine, who was a member of the expedition. In this attempt he failed, as the box of young plants which he had secured was unfortunately washed overboard, after he had preserved them for eight months.

It was Condamine, too, who first described the Chinchona tree of Loxa in the 'Mémoires de l'Académie.' This expedition possesses a sad interest also with regard to the fate of Joseph de Jussieu; a family name immortalised by the distinguished scientific labours of three successive generations. 'After fifteen years of laborious work, he was robbed of his large collection of plants by a servant at Buenos Ayres, who believed that the boxes contained money. This loss had a disastrous effect on poor Jussieu, who, in 1771, returned to France deprived of reason after an absence of thirty-six years.'

It is unnecessary to follow the gradual steps by which the prejudices, which for some time interfered with the general adoption of the medicine, were overcome, and its great importance ultimately recognised. The interest which it has ever since excited, and the value universally attached to it, cannot be more strikingly shown than by the number of distinct treatises of which these products have formed the subject. Van Bergen, in his valuable Monographie, gives a catalogue of these works, amounting to 637 publications, and occupying 72 pages in his book. In 1777, the well-known botanical expedition under MM. Ruiz and Pavon, was sent to Peru by the Spanish Government. The scientific results of this important expedition were embodied in the 'Flora Peruviana et Chilensis' of Ruiz and Pavon, published at Madrid in 1798-1802, in the 'Quinologia' of Ruiz in 1792, and in the supplement to that work by the two colleagues conjointly in 1801. Dr. Weddell's great work, 'Histoire Naturelle des Quinquinas,' was published in 1849, and contains a series of plates figuring the different species, and consisting of perhaps the most beautiful and effective *outline* engraving ever devoted to botanical illustration.\*

In Mr. Howard's recently published 'Nueva quinologia' of Pavon, no fewer than thirty-nine species of Chinchona are enumerated and named, of which, however, several are, in all probability, varieties only produced by climate, situation, and other ordinary causes of vegetable variation. No person living is more competent than Mr. Howard at once to produce a critical botanical exposition of the genus, and to estimate the comparative therapeutic value of each species. The illustra-

\* The inferiority of our English engravers in this peculiar department of illustrative art cannot be denied. The character which is given to every leaf and flower by the perfect accuracy of the drawing, and by the tasteful and effective introduction of the dark line, by several of the German and French engravers, is, with perhaps one exception, scarcely attained by any of our own artists.

tions, too, are from the masterly pencil of Mr. Fitch, which is tantamount to saying that they are unequalled excepting by some of his own productions.

Modern chemistry, by the discovery of the vegetable alkaloids in which the virtues of many of the most important medicinal plants are found to reside, has rendered the administration of such remedies at once more certain and more easy; and in the case of the present article of the *Materia Medica*, every other means of its administration has almost entirely given place to this modification of its essential remedial elements. It is now ascertained that no fewer than four distinct alkaloids, having more or less singular qualities, exist in different proportions in the species of *Chinchona*. 'The final discovery of quinine is due to the French chemists Pelletier and Gaventon, in 1820. They considered that a vegetable alkaloid, analogous to morphine and strychnine, existed in quinquina bark; and they afterwards discovered that the febrifugal principle was seated in two alkaloids, separate or together, in the different kinds of bark, called *quinine* and *chinchonine*, with the same virtues, which, however, were more powerful in quinine.\* Two other alkaloids were discovered in 1852 by M. Pasteur, named *quinidine* and *chinchonidine*: these are found principally in the barks of New Granada, and the latter is considered as second only to quinine in its medicinal virtues.

The obvious importance of keeping up the supply of so precious a material appears to have been long lost sight of, and the most reckless extravagance, and an utter disregard of future requirements, characterised the conduct of the bark collectors. The Government of Spain made but few and unsatisfactory efforts to supply by cultivation the waste which was daily increasing, and the total destruction of the trees appeared imminent. The testimony of Dr. Weddell shows that in many cases it was the custom to bark the trees while they were standing, which, of course, ensured their death; or if they were felled, the collectors took the bark from that side of the tree only which was uppermost, to save themselves the trouble of turning over the trunk. No extent of country on which the

---

\* Some discussion has recently taken place respecting the comparative merits of these two alkaloids. Dr. Daniel of Jamaica states that his experience in the treatment of febrile diseases in Western Africa was unfavourable to chinchonine, as producing cerebral disturbances. Dr. Macpherson of Calcutta, and Mr. Howard, have both come to a contrary conclusion, but consider it as about one-third less powerful than quinine. (*Pharm. Journ.*, vol. iv. p. 561.)



trees grew could suffice to counterbalance such wanton improvidence as this, and yet the Spanish Government, and subsequently the revolutionary Governments, appear to have been equally careless of the future.

The attempt of Condamine, in connexion with the French expedition of 1739, and subsequent explorations by whomsoever undertaken, had for their object rather to acquire a knowledge of the different species of Chinchona and their relative value, and to ascertain their geographical distribution, than to procure their transportation to other places of growth. The mission of Dr. Weddell, under the orders of the French Government, commenced during the reign of Louis-Philippe, was by far the most important expedition undertaken before that of Mr. Markham. Dr. Weddell, whose scientific knowledge perfectly qualified him for the task, made two voyages to South America with the primary object of obtaining information respecting the Chinchona trees, and he thoroughly investigated the districts in which they grew, both in Southern Peru and Bolivia. His great work before alluded to contains the results of these investigations, and, together with his subsequent account of his travels, affords a vast amount of information both scientific and practical. He also brought seeds of one of the most important species, *C. Calisaya*, to Paris, from which plants were raised in the Jardin des Plantes, in 1848. Many of these were distributed, and some were sent by the Dutch Government to Java. Nothing further appears to have been attempted by the Government of France; and the Dutch, who possess in the island of Java a range of forest-covered mountains admirably adapted for Chinchona cultivation, were the first to take active steps for its introduction into the Eastern hemisphere. Praiseworthy as were these early attempts, they were, however, from various causes, followed by very limited success. The plants collected for transportation proved, with few exceptions, to belong to almost worthless species; and of those which were of the better sorts, many perished for want of due care and of a sufficient practical knowledge of the proper mode of cultivation.\*

\* It does not appear to us that this statement is materially impugned by the fact, as stated by Dr. de Vry, that the Dutch Government, at the instance of the late Lord Canning, presented the Indian Government with a supply of 106 *Calisaya* plants grown from Java seeds, before our own success had rendered us wholly independent of extrinsic assistance; since, up to the end of the year 1860, after six years' cultivation, the number of plants of that valuable species in Java amounted to only 7,300, whilst those of comparatively

Without dwelling upon the difficulties and comparative failure of the Dutch proceedings, it is more interesting now to trace our own more successful career in this important undertaking. The credit of the first suggestion of the transplantation of Chinchona trees into our own dependencies is due to Dr. Royle, whose acute and sagacious mind had thoroughly appreciated the importance of such a measure, and whose residence in India had convinced him of its practicability. In 1839 Dr. Royle, in his '*Illustrations of Himalayan Botany*,' recommended the introduction of Chinchona plants into India, pointing out the Neilgherry and Silhet Hills as suitable sites for the experiment. One urgent appeal after another was made to the Government, without, however, receiving the attention which the subject deserved, or producing any practical results.

'The proposal,' says Mr. Markham, 'to introduce the Chinchona plants into India was first made officially in a dispatch from the Governor-General dated March 27, 1852. It was referred to the late Dr. Royle, as reporter on Indian products to the East India Company, who drew up an able memorandum on the subject, dated June, 1852: "To the Indian Government," he said, "the home supply of a drug which already cost 7,000*l.*\* a year would be advantageously in an economical point of view, and invaluable as affording means of employing a drug which is indispensable in the treatment of Indian fevers. I have no hesitation in saying that, after the Chinese teas, no more important plant could be introduced into India." The only result of this application from India was, that the Foreign Office was requested to obtain a supply of plants and seeds from the consuls in South America.' (*Markham*, p. 62.)

The excuses and indifference of some of these gentlemen, and the total failure of success in the only case of a meritorious concurrence on the part of Mr. Cope the consul-general at Quito, who transmitted plants and seeds to England—the loss of some plants and seeds transmitted by Dr. Weddell, and of others again procured through Mr. Pentland, did not deter Dr. Royle from making further efforts. 'In May, 1853, he drew up a second long and valuable but fruitless report upon the subject;' and in March, 1856, he

---

worthless species are almost to be reckoned by millions. The discussion of this subject does not come within the scope of our object in this review, and we must refer to the statements of Mr. Markham (*Travels*, p. 47.), and to Dr. de Vry's communication and Mr. Markham's reply in the *Pharmaceutical Journal*, vol. iv. p. 439.

\* So great was the subsequent increase in the demand for bark and quinine in India, that in the year 1857–8, upon a moderate computation, the expenditure amounted to about 54,500*l.*

made a final attempt to induce the Indian Government to take the necessary steps. The death of this excellent botanist and estimable man, whose useful labours were cut short at a moment when they had become fully appreciated, and when his influence would probably have gradually carried out this his favourite project, put a stop for a time to all the interest which Government appeared to have taken in it. The stimulus had, however, been given, and in 1859 efficient measures were taken which resulted in the present complete success, to the great credit of Lord Stanley and of the able agents whom he sent out.

It is at this juncture that we have to take up the mission of Mr. Markham, who appears to have possessed all the requisite qualifications for effectually accomplishing its design. His previous acquaintance with a considerable part of the Chinchona districts of Peru, where however his former pursuits had no reference to the object which he was destined afterwards to execute with so much perseverance and success, gave him a considerable advantage. It is evident throughout the whole of his narrative that Mr. Markham possesses a remarkable aptitude for selecting and acquiring exactly the kind of knowledge required for his purpose, and no less judgment in applying it. His steady perseverance, his untiring energy, his courage and endurance, and the tact with which he met and overcame the most perplexing difficulties, could alone have enabled him to bring his labours to so successful an issue. In 1859 he was 'authorised by Lord Stanley, then Secretary of State for India, to make such arrangements as should best ensure the success of an enterprise the results of which were expected to add materially to the resources of our Indian empire.' Profiting by the failure of the Dutch proceedings in Java, which have been alluded to, Mr. Markham determined to direct his efforts to procuring those species which were the most valuable in their therapeutic qualities: but here it was necessary to have the assistance of able botanists and of judicious practical men, and to employ persons to collect in the different districts to which the best species are indigenous. 'On December 17, 1859,' he says, 'we sailed from England, and, crossing the Isthmus of Panama, arrived at Lima, the capital of Peru, on January 26, 1860. Thirty Wardian cases for the plants had been sent out round Cape Horn, and I forwarded fifteen to Guayaquil for Mr. Spruce's collection, and fifteen to the Port of Islay, in Southern Peru, to await my return from the Chinchona forests.'

It was on March 2nd that the expedition landed at Islay, and on the 6th they started on their long and perilous journey.

We cannot follow step by step the progress of the expedition; but the details given by Mr. Markham are exceedingly interesting, and his remarks on the present and future of the vast country to which his researches were principally directed, are of great importance: indeed the whole record of his journey forms one of the most captivating books of travels of the present day. After long, laborious, and dangerous journeyings, in which hunger, illness, and the enmity of those who were interested, or fancied themselves so, in preventing the accomplishment of the object of the mission, Mr. Markham and his indefatigable associates succeeded in procuring a considerable number of plants of the most valuable species of *Chinchona*. The collection of Caravayan plants amounted to 529.

‘On May 11th, Mr. Weir completed the packing of the plants, and we were preparing for the journey up into the *pajonales* on the following day, having previously fixed on the Calasaya trees from which we intended to obtain a supply of seeds in August, when Gironda (his hitherto friendly host) received an ominous letter from Don José Mariano Bobadilla, the Alcaldé Municipal of Quiaca, ordering him to prevent me from taking away a single plant, to arrest both myself and the person who had acted as my guide, and send us to Quiaca. I found that an outcry against my proceedings had been raised . . . and that the people of Sandia and Quiaca had been excited by assertions that the exportation of Cascarilla seeds would prove the ruin of themselves and their descendants.’

Taking leave therefore of Gironda, after writing a strong protest to the Alcaldé of Quiaca, the party proceeded on their hasty journey to Sandia, where they arrived on the 15th, and found things there in a very alarming state. With extreme difficulty, and by no small amount of ingenuity, the danger was avoided, and on June 1st the plants were safely deposited in the Wardian cases at the port of Islay.

In the meantime Mr. Spruce had been successfully following out the objects of his especial mission in the Republic of Ecuador, the seat of *Chinchona succirubra*, the most valuable of all the species, as affording the largest proportion of the febrifugal alkaloids. This pursuit was not unaccompanied by difficulty and danger, which it required all the zeal and perseverance of this enterprising traveller and botanist to overcome. Mr. Cross had conveyed the fifteen Wardian cases already mentioned, as destined for Mr. Spruce, to Ventanas, in the neighbourhood of Limon, after his arrival at which place the collection of plants ‘commenced in earnest. A piece of ground ‘was fenced in, and Mr. Cross made a pit and prepared the soil ‘to receive the cuttings, of which he put in above a thousand,’

beside layers. In addition to these proceedings, Mr. Spruce went to the southward to collect the seeds of the same precious species, which were now ripe, and the result was the acquisition of at least 100,000 well ripened and dried seeds. Conducting the precious freight from Ventanas on a raft to Guayaquil, 'Mr. Cross arrived with the plants from Limon on December 13, and established them in the Wardian cases to the number of 637.' The opposition of the government was too tardy to prevent the successful transportation of the treasure, which was safe on the Neilgherry Hills, at the very time when the legislature of Ecuador issued a prohibition to all persons, whether native or foreign, to make collections of plants, cuttings, or seeds of the Quina tree.

The Greybarks, *Chinchona nitida*, *micrantha*, &c., were the particular object of Mr. Pritchett's mission to the Huanoco district in Northern Peru, and he appears to have executed it with much success. Plants and seeds of the species yielding this variety of bark were obtained and sent to Lima.

A second expedition of Mr. Cross to Loxa, for the especial purpose of obtaining the seeds of *Chinchona Condaminea*, completed the various operations undertaken for the important purpose of procuring and transporting to India the most valuable species of the bark-producing trees; and whilst they reflect the greatest credit on Mr. Markham, by whom the various operations were organised, and by whose personal efforts a large portion of them were carried out, warm praise is also due to his coadjutors, Mr. Spruce, Dr. Taylor, Mr. Pritchett, Mr. Cross, and Mr. Weir, by whose zealous and indefatigable co-operation the great object of the mission was effected. We have already stated that the Neilgherry Hills were considered by Dr. Royle as the locality most favourable for the successful cultivation of Chinchona. Mr. Markham's acquaintance with the climate, soil, and other attributes of the native country of the genus, led him to the same conclusion; and it was to this part of India that the plants and seeds obtained by him and his coadjutors were now to be transported.

'Here are to be found,' says Mr. Markham, 'a climate, an amount of moisture, a vegetation, and an elevation above the sea, more analogous to those of Chinchona forests in South America than can be met with in any other part of India. In the Government Gardens at Ootacamund on the Neilgherries, there were the necessary conveniences for propagating plants and raising seedlings; and in Mr. William G. M'Ivor, the superintendent, was to be found a zealous, intelligent, practical gardener, who had carefully studied the botany of the Chinchona genus, and under whose care the cultivation would

be commenced with the best possible guarantees for its success. . . . With this object in view, we landed at the port of Calicut on the coast of Malabar, on October 7, 1861.' (P. 339.)

The Neilgherries are acknowledged to be the most salubrious district in the whole of India. Its stations, Ootacamund, Kotageri, and Coonoor, are the favourite resorts of invalids, and the varied climates which are produced by their different elevations afford every degree of bracing or of soft air which can be desired, with a clearness and purity which are most healthful not only to the human constitution, but to vegetation. To Ootacamund, then, the principal of these stations, the plants and seeds, destined in all probability to be the parents of millions of future denizens of this delightful region, were now to be transmitted.

In selecting the sites suited to the different species, it was necessary to assimilate them as nearly as possible to those in which they flourish best amongst their native mountains; and this not only with respect to elevation, but to soil, temperature, humidity, and other important elements in successful cultivation. The practical experience and judgment of Mr. M'Ivor were here of the greatest value. He had, previously to Mr. Markham's arrival, selected a site for the highest plantation in a wooded ravine or *shola* at the back of the hills which rise above the Government Gardens.

'The Dodabetta site, being four or five degrees warmer than Ootacamund, throughout the year, has a temperature, on the whole, somewhat warmer than the lofty regions where those species of *Chinchona* grow for the cultivation of which this position is selected. The elevation above the sea exactly corresponds, and the amount of humidity is about the same. . . . The character of the scenery and vegetation very closely resembles that of the Pajonal country between the valleys of Sandia and Tampota in Carabaya, where the shrub *Calisaya* flourishes. The site is protected by rising grounds from the cold northerly winds, and the temperature became warmer as we ascended through the wood.'

These circumstances, and the analogous character of the Flora of the Dodabetta ravine to that of the loftier parts of the native *Chinchona* region, determined the choice of this site for the species which require such conditions. Similar considerations led to the selection of stations for other species; but the site above mentioned may be considered as the most important, as it will be used as an experimental and central plantation by Mr. M'Ivor, who is there successfully raising plants for future distribution over various parts of India and elsewhere. In anticipation of this great object being carried out by private spe-

cultation, Mr. M'Ivor has recently published a very useful pamphlet, the title of which is at the head of this article. Its object is 'to place in the hands of all who are interested in the extension and increase of this valuable product, a knowledge of the management of the plants in their earlier stages, or up to the period to which our experience in their cultivation extends. The Government of Madras has already placed the Chinchona within the reach of the general public by authorising the distribution of the plants at four annas each;' and Mr. M'Ivor proceeds to show, by clear practical directions for their cultivation and management, how to obviate disappointment in these important speculations. The selection of sites for plantations with reference to aspect, rainfall, elevation, the transportation of the plants in Wardian cases, the various modes of propagation, the formation of nurseries, and all points connected with cultivation, are given with the greatest plainness, and with an amount of information which is remarkable, considering how recently the experiments upon which the directions are founded have been commenced.

It is, then, to the judicious management of Mr. M'Ivor that we have now to look for the solution of the great problem of our becoming independent, for the supply of one of the most important articles in the whole *Materia Medica*, of a country where a wasteful improvidence threatens the extermination of the trees which produce it, and where the difficulties of procuring it, and its increasing scarcity, must render its acquisition more and more expensive and precarious. It is a triumph which must always reflect the greatest credit upon the persevering and courageous men to whose labours we are indebted for obtaining and transporting the precious treasures, and to him who has already commenced, with the certainty of success, their propagation and dispersion. The progress of this work under Mr. M'Ivor's able management forms the subject of a very interesting chapter in Mr. Markham's book. Of this it would exceed our limits to give even an abstract; but the present state of the Chinchona operations in India has been reported upon in monthly official letters from Mr. M'Ivor to the Government Secretary, three of which are now before us, the substance of which will be read with great interest. They contain reports on the number, distribution, and condition of Chinchona plants on the Neilgherries, to the dates respectively of March 31, April 10, and May 9, 1863. It appears from the latest of these reports that the total number of plants of eleven species of Chinchona amounts to 157,704. The number of plants planted out during last month being 5,647, making a total of 41,397

‘permanently planted out in the plantations. The increase by ‘propagation during the month is 12,565.’ It appears from the same document that the distribution of plants to other localities has already commenced, the numbers sent out being 2,628, while the interest which this object of commercial adventure has already excited is strikingly shown by the fact that about 50,000 plants are already bespoken; ‘and when it is ‘remembered,’ says Mr. M’Ivor, ‘that no public advertisement ‘has been made of the intention of the Government to dispose ‘of the plants, this fact clearly establishes that Chinchona cultivation will be extensively taken up by private enterprise.’

It is always interesting to record the first successful results of an important and beneficial enterprise. Mr. Howard, who has made the practical working of this subject as much his own as the scientific knowledge upon which it is based, transmitted in June last to the Under Secretary of State for India, a report on the bark and leaves of *Chinchona succirubra* grown in India, which had been forwarded to him for examination and analysis. In this highly interesting report, which is now before us, Mr. Howard states that ‘the powder resembles that of good Peruvian bark.’ Proceeding with his analysis, he says, ‘I commenced with 500 grains of that of the second year’s growth, and was able to obtain therefrom a first and second crystallisation of white sulphate of quinine. . . . The crystallisations I obtained were mixed with some sulphate of Chinconidine. . . . I also obtained some Chinconine and other usual products of the process as from South American bark. . . . I found the total contents 3·30 to 3·40. . . . This result must be considered extremely favourable.’ Mr. Howard concludes by the important statement that ‘the structure of the ‘barks, as shown by the microscope, makes it evident that ‘the plants had grown vigorously, and under circumstances ‘favourable to their full development.’ On the 18th of the same month, at the last meeting of the session of the Linnean Society, Mr. Howard exhibited, to the great satisfaction of the members present, specimens of this, the first Chinchona bark sent to this country from India, together with some of the alkaloids in ethereal solution obtained from the leaves, and two small phials of sulphate of quinine obtained from the bark. The production of these precious alkaloids from bark grown in our own possessions is now, therefore, an accomplished fact.

But it was not to India alone that the transplantation of Chinchona was to be confined. On Mr. Markham’s departure on his mission, a dépôt was formed at Kew, under the direction



of Sir William Hooker, with a new propagating house and every other requisite for the safe keeping and propagation of the plants, and their distribution to various parts of our colonies. From thence, besides India and Ceylon, they have, we believe, been sent to Jamaica, Trinidad, Dominica, Queensland, Natal, Algiers, and Western Africa. From some of these parts favourable accounts of their progress have been received; and the report of Mr. Wilson, the curator of the Botanic Gardens, at Bath, in Jamaica, and that from Mr. Crugor, in Trinidad, are highly promising. The climate and other essential requisites for the cultivation of *Chinchona* in the former island are found to be perfectly suitable, and several hundred plants have already been raised from seeds furnished from that source.

The cultivation of *Chinchona* in Ceylon deserves a separate mention from the success which has already attended its introduction into that country.

‘The hill districts of the island of Ceylon, which have the necessary elevation, and are within the region of both monsoons, offer peculiarly favourable conditions for the cultivation of *Chinchona* plants, probably equal to the best localities on the peninsula of India. Mr. Thwaites, the director of the Royal Botanical Gardens at Peradenia, takes a deep interest in this important measure, and under his auspices there can be no doubt of its ultimate success. It was from the first determined to send a portion of the *Chinchona* seeds to Ceylon, although the whole expense of the undertaking has been borne by the revenues of India, and no assistance whatever has been given by those colonies which will thus profit by its success.’ (*Markham*, p. 509.)

Already the cultivation has been commenced, and with the best prospects. Besides plants which have been raised from cuttings, and two flourishing ones previously transmitted from Kew, six Wardian cases were sent in March, 1862, from the dépôt at that place, and 800 plants of different kinds had in September last been raised from seed. ‘*Chinchona* cultivation in Ceylon has thus been fairly started. It is,’ adds Mr. Markham, ‘exceedingly gratifying to hear that many coffee-planters will be glad to try the experiment upon their estates; and that Mr. Thwaites will shortly be in a position to distribute plants from the Hakgalle Garden.’

It is not within the scope of our present object to dwell upon the narrative of Mr. Markham’s journeyings, nor upon the interesting accounts he gives of the history and antiquities, the customs and mode of life, the scenery, soil, natural products, cultivation and other points of importance, which he has shown himself well able to discuss in a practical and philosophic spirit. The careful perusal of his work will amply repay the reader by

the amount of economic information it contains, no less than by the interest which attaches to a great country, emerging from its struggles for independence, and beginning to feel the consciousness of its own power and resources.

There is, however, one subject of present absorbing interest which appears collaterally to call for a short notice from us as having had much light thrown upon it from Mr. Markham's observations, and from the reports which are placed at the head of this article. The cotton of Peru, a different species from that of North America, possesses qualities which would appear, from the testimony of competent authorities, to be more available for Indian cultivation, at least in many extensive districts, than that of the North American species. Even from Peru itself no small amount of supply, additional to that already derived from that source, may probably be obtained; and there appears to be a disposition in that country to encourage its cultivation. The attention of Mr. Markham was called to this object, and the following statement is not without its present interest:—

‘It has been calculated that in the cotton-growing districts of Lambayeque, Chiclayo, and Truxillo alone, after leaving a fifth of the available land for crops to supply provisions for the inhabitants, as many as 140,000 *Janagadas* (about 1,200,000 acres) might be brought under cotton cultivation. Allowing four feet for each plant, and that each plant yields four pounds a year, this extent of land would produce 580,000,000 lbs. of cotton annually, worth 12 dollars the cwt. at the port of shipment, or 69,600,000 dollars. Deducting 22,400,000 for expenses, this would leave 47,200,000 dollars' profit. But these provinces contain but a small portion of the fertile coast valleys of Peru; and it is clear that, if the speculations of 1860 yield a reasonably profitable return, the cultivation of cotton may, in all probability, be undertaken over a vast area, and render Peru an important source of supply for Manchester.’ (*Markham*, p. 303.)

Still it is on the extensive cultivation of cotton in India that the hopes of this country must mainly rest for future supply; and the inquiries which have recently been set on foot have been replied to in reports and memoranda from men in every respect qualified to form a correct and practical judgment. The direction to which they all point is the substitution of the Peruvian species for the native Indian, or the North American varieties, as possessing great advantages for cultivation in extensive tracts of country, which assimilate in their physical characters to the Peruvian cotton districts. The true Peruvian cotton possesses a much longer staple than the indigenous Indian, and is, therefore, much better calculated for the Manchester market,

whilst it will grow well in those districts which are unsuited to the North American species. 'It is very important,' says Mr. Markham, in his memorandum to the Indian Government dated April, 1862, 'to introduce a cotton with a longer staple than that of the indigenous plant of India, and, therefore, better suited to the demand of Manchester, which will thrive in the exceedingly dry climate of the collectorates on the eastern side of the Madras Presidency. . . . The staple of this Peruvian cotton is longer than that of "Uplands" Peruvian nambuco, and much longer than any indigenous Indian cotton.' An elaborate comparison between the analogous regions in Peru and India occupies the greater part of Mr. Markham's memorandum, by which it is clearly shown that the Peruvian cotton, which now commands a high price in the Manchester market, may be cultivated to almost any extent in those parts of India which are unsuited for the growth of the North American kinds. Dr. Wight, whose long residence and official position in India, and his well-known practical acquaintance with the applied botanical science of that country, give great weight to his opinion, gives a similar testimony in a short memorandum dated July, 1862. He says: 'I think that it is in every way desirable that the Peruvian plant should be extensively and perseveringly tried in the Carnatic, especially along the wide sandy flats bounding nearly all the larger rivers and streams which intersect the country between the central range of hills and the coast;' and he concludes with the hope that his suggestions may prove useful in securing success to this very promising plan for adding another and *superior variety of cotton* to those already in cultivation in India. Mr. Spruce, in his official notes on cotton cultivation, says: 'A good deal of cotton of great length and strength of fibre is grown at Maynas, at Torapoto and Lamas, from 1,200 up to 2,500 feet elevation. . . . The cotton,' he adds, 'grown at Torapoto is the strongest I have seen anywhere in the world. Of its excellence there can be no doubt; I have seen no finer cotton, and for length and strength of fibre it is unequalled.' The whole of the three memoranda from which these extracts are taken are well worth attention. Their concurrent recommendation appears to us to point to India as our future certain source of cotton supply, and to the Peruvian species as likely to supersede, with immense advantage, the inferior native kinds now cultivated in extensive districts, which it clearly appears may be increased to an almost unlimited extent.

ART. VIII.—*History of England during the Reign of George the Third.* By JOHN GEORGE PHILLIMORE. London: 1863.

THE author of this strange volume is Reader of Constitutional Law and History at the Inns of Court under the present system of Legal Education. If his lectures correspond with his book, Mr. Phillimore's appointment warrants in some degree his repeated sneers at the heads of our law as wanting in common sense and discernment. It is certainly strange that a learned society, which till lately boasted among its members the honoured names of Macaulay and Hallam, should have chosen as a commentator on our Polity a writer whose turn for rant and railing, and utter want of sober thought, would appear to disentitle him to the office. For ourselves, we shall only approve the selection and commend this specimen of the 'History of England,' when ridiculous theories put recklessly forward, unsound, superficial, and conceited views, a judgment singularly paradoxical and partial, an incapacity to present facts in their true light, a habit of indiscriminate abuse, a narrative at once prolix and obscure, and a style tawdry, jerking, and shrewish, shall be esteemed the proper qualifications for an historian. Meanwhile, although the only object of Mr. Phillimore is to 'search for truth,' as in his own opinion 'the period of George III.'s reign has never yet been fairly described,' we hope, in the interest of good sense, that this performance will not be repeated, and whisper audibly to the author—

Θεορίτ' ἀνεπαύμυθε λόγους περ ἰὼν ἀγορητῆς  
ἴσχετο.—

After a preface in which Mr. Phillimore tells us 'that he follows in the path which was trodden by him who said prophetically that he wrote for all time,' this volume opens with a long dissertation on the genius and character of the History of England. The views he has expressed 'await the equitable verdict of posterity,' and may await it for ever, for if his own appreciation of our times be correct, 'contemporaries' will assuredly 'neglect' them 'in the total extinction of taste' among us. For instance, it is a prevalent notion that the people of England throughout their history have given distinctive proofs of the qualities which deserve the appellation of greatness. Heroic energy, capacity for government, innate reverence of law and authority, and a strong and enduring

sense of nationality, have been usually ascribed to the island race which has reared the edifice of the British Empire. It has been thought that the great revolutions through which we can trace our gradual progress from Norman tyranny to modern civilisation—the establishment of our equal general law, the reformation of our mediæval church, and the settlement of our political rights, afford some evidence that moderation and justice pervade widely the British nation. Nay, though our polity owes its existence in some degree to peculiar circumstances, it has been supposed that it never could have grown up among a people of inferior character. If the firm monarchy planted by the Conqueror was the cause that England was comparatively free from the anarchy of extreme feudalism, and, possibly, that the English nobility was never a distinct and exclusive caste; and if at the crisis of the sixteenth century our insular situation protected the Constitution by rendering a standing army unnecessary, it was the sturdy strength of the Saxon nature that rescued the yeomen and peasantry of England from a state of perpetual thralldom and wretchedness; it was the practical wisdom of the English middle classes that matured the influence of the House of Commons; it was the mixed respect for authority and self-government, ingrained deeply in the English character, that secured the ascendancy of the Common Law; it was the peculiar tendency of the national genius that established as checks on a Central Executive that mass of locally powerful institutions to which we owe so much of our liberties. Without ‘flattering the coarseness of our nature or indulging in boisterous panegyrics on ourselves,’ we may say that only a great nation could have filled the parts in the majestic drama which connects the England of the Plantagenets and Tudors with the England of our kingly Commonwealth.

Such opinions as these are, however, too trite for this *Novum Organum* of Historical Philosophy. That we have reached greatness it is impossible to deny, but then we have not achieved it ourselves, it has been thrust on us by ‘a few eminent citizens,’ who devised for us a ‘form of government’ that has ‘made us glorious in spite of ourselves’ and ‘saved us from lethargic servitude.’ Like inferior plants, the English people have been placed in a kind of moral hotbed by three or four political Paxtons, and the process has given them ‘a constitution which alone has vivified’ the brute mass and ‘gained for them a place in history.’ To this secret of a few regenerators it is due exclusively that the British race are not a mere inert populace untrained to freedom and incapable of empire. For,

as Mr. Phillimore soberly observes, the essential character of the English nation is a compound of Bæotian stolidity and of the coarse vileness of the Romans of Juvenal. They possess, indeed, 'many useful qualities;' they are 'brave, persevering, 'patient, and enterprising;' but they are a 'thoroughly selfish 'and rude people,' with 'the servile genius of the Teutons,' who 'wallow in the mire of practical life,' and 'degenerate rapidly 'from a high standard.' They have always 'shown a singular 'incapacity for the government of other races and countries;' 'public spirit has never been their characteristic;' and 'no great 'nation has ever been so implicit to surrender the reality' of all that they should prize, 'provided they see certain forms observed, 'and hear certain sounds repeated.' Intellectually, moreover, 'they have no idea of grandeur;' 'their genius is neither penetrating nor comprehensive; no taste has been allotted to 'them;' and they are remarkable for 'a delight in microscopic 'detail and a total absence of anything like the power of generalisation.' It was certainly a wonderful forcing machine that out of such unpromising materials produced the countrymen of Wolsey and Chatham, of Clive and Wellesley, of Bacon and Shakspeare.

That a form of government made Englishmen, and that Englishmen did not make their form of government, will remind the reader of the Laputan architecture, which began a house from the roof downwards. We wish, however, that Mr. Phillimore had told us who were 'the eminent few' that achieved the metamorphosis he has described, and what was the 'form 'of government' that has rescued the English nation from brutishness. If our history teaches any lesson, it is that our empire, and our actual civilisation, have been the result of national efforts, continued through successive centuries, and gradually raising us to our present fortune. That individuals have become conspicuous in this achievement is a mere truism; but England, like the Roman Republic, owes less to isolated men of mark than any community equally celebrated. Had Langton and Pembroke never existed, Magna Charta would have been certainly won; our common law would have been created without the patronage of Edward I.; our national Church would have been reformed whether Henry VIII. had reigned or not; and the Long Parliament would have done its work, though Pym and Hampden had never sat in it. Indeed, except the mythical Alfred, no individual emerges in our history who can be said to have fixed its course; and there is no English Hannibal or Napoleon, nor even an English Sully or Richelieu. As for our 'form of government,' we venture to

think that, except in a few organic principles, it has been in a state of continual change, and has gone through a series of revolutions that have made it vary at different periods. In the fourteenth century it was a feudal sovereignty; in the seventeenth, it inclined to absolutism; in the eighteenth, it was a kingly oligarchy; and in the present age it is a constitutional monarchy. And yet this machine—however altered, and apparently fitted for different uses at different stages of its existence—invariably turns out the same work; that is, through a long succession of ages, regenerates the degraded English nature! An agency whose forces are ever changing, yet always produce the same effect, is certainly a very interesting marvel, adapted, no doubt, to the understandings of a people who, as Mr. Phillimore remarks, feel pleasure ‘in extravagant commonplaces, and take on trust much silly scepticism.’

In truth, it is odd that even ‘the form of our government’ should receive the approbation of Mr. Phillimore. For if, according to his theory, the structure is so wonderful as a whole, its separate parts, he evidently thinks, are detrimental to the body politic. For instance, he condemns monarchy as an institution, and raves hysterically at our kings, though he condescends to praise Queen Victoria. In his view, monarchy has been a cause of the ‘abject servitude’ of so many of our Peers, of the sycophancy of our Church, and the corruption of our Parliaments; and its social effects have been very mischievous in creating a taste for ‘rattles and playthings,’ and even, it would seem, for hoops and lappets—‘a display very different from that of Cornelia.’ As for our House of Lords, it has ‘too often betrayed an obsequious complaisance that could hardly have been exceeded;’ and some ‘exceptions only can be made to the gross corruptions, the dark prejudice, and the flagrant servility of the House of Commons.’ With regard to our Church, Mr. Phillimore assures us not only that it illustrates ‘the alliance between priest and king, cemented by the blood and tortures of the noblest of our species’—that ‘it has been content to receive pay and titles as the price of insignificance and insincerity’—but that nowadays ‘its clergy have learnt to reconcile their pecuniary interests with their vanity, and at the same time to be paid for faith and admired for incredulity.’ And as for our law, and ‘its gang of judges,’ we are told—in certainly a hundred places, in every mood and tense of abuse—that, at least until the other day, the one was ‘a bottomless magazine of absurdity,’ ‘an anarchy of chicane and chance,’ an ‘art to obstruct truth, and make the triumph of substantial justice as nearly impossible

'as was consistent with the very existence of society,' and that the others were a set of dastards and harpies, whose characteristics were 'narrowness, an antipathy to all that bore any 'mark of elevation and refinement, and an ignorance of all but 'the merest routine,' together 'with an indifference to the 'welfare of others, a slovenly neglect of all that was important, 'a sordid respect for wealth, and an abject deference for authority.' If our cardinal institutions have had such mischievous effects, what is that residuum of 'a form of government' that accomplishes Mr. Phillimore's miracle?

Having set out with these trifling paradoxes, Mr. Phillimore sketches our history rapidly from the Conquest to the Revolution of 1688. The sketch attests the justice of his observation, that 'a mind may stagger under the weight of accumulated facts, 'which it has neither strength to grasp nor sagacity to methodise.' The only tolerable parts of this review have been borrowed from Lord Macaulay — as, for instance, the remarks on the character of our aristocracy, on the nature of the Tudor monarchy, and of the crisis of the sixteenth century — and they have been a good deal injured in the process. In fact, even when consciously copying, Mr. Phillimore cannot avoid exaggeration, and his imitations remind the reader of the valet who dresses after his master. An utter want of philosophic insight, and of the power of arranging facts, combined with characteristic extravagance, are, however, his principal defects; and the result is, that his treatment of the subject is exceedingly shallow, meagre, and pretentious. For example, it would have been more satisfactory to have learned something of our mediæval institutions, and of their relation with our present history, than to find the whole matter summarily dismissed 'as a dreadful period of servitude and oppression, which 'has branded on modern Europe scars that, even now, in this 'favoured country, are deep and visible.' Instead of reading that, in the fourteenth century, 'the law became more intricate 'and warped,' we should like to have had some account of the changes to which that law undoubtedly contributed in relieving England from the curse of villeinage. If there was no space for a full picture of the great moral and social revolution which England witnessed during the Tudor period, it was hardly philosophical to characterise our Reformation as the work 'of 'the most perfectly wicked and detestable of all modern tyrants,' or to describe the ritual of Henry VIII. as a 'blasphemous 'medley of ludicrous contradictions.' If the Church of England in the seventeenth century was not free from the charge of persecution, it would have been more just to contrast



her intolerance with that of the Church of Alva and Richelieu than to proclaim her prelates, 'from Parker to Shelden, as the 'most odious characters in modern history.' Nor will the readers of the present generation, who have been reminded by a mighty voice of the treason of James II. against their rights, believe that in the Revolution of 1688 'there is almost as much 'to blush for as to admire,' or that 'the confinement of seven 'bishops for a few days in the Tower, without the slightest 'danger to their persons, and very little to their property,' was the sole cause of that memorable deliverance.

From a Reader of Constitutional History we might have expected a clear account of the effects of the Revolution of 1688, in establishing the ascendancy of Parliamentary Government, and settling finally our political liberties. No writer, moreover, in reviewing this period, should omit to notice the marked advance which England made in a few years, the influence she suddenly acquired in Europe, the rapid expansion of her commercial wealth, and the development of her maritime superiority. All this Mr. Phillimore ignores, and hurries on to an elaborate caricature of the state of the nation in general at the time of the first sovereigns of the House of Brunswick. At this period there is no doubt that, compared with an ideal standard, or even with our actual civilisation, there were many abuses in our social system, and even in some of our institutions; that the tone of national morality was low, and that our manners were rude and devoid of refinement. By giving supreme powers to Houses of Parliament not then responsible to popular censure, by overthrowing an ancient dynasty, and by striking at the pretensions of the Church, the Revolution, with many blessings, had brought with it political corruption, a decay of loyalty, and latitudinarian ideas, and it had stopped short, so to speak, in reforming a large mass of social anomalies and evils. Moreover, in an age when public opinion had as yet comparatively little force, and education hardly existed except for the higher classes of the realm, the type of morality was inevitably bad, and this tendency was not a little promoted by the example of a dissolute Court, and of an aristocracy uncontrolled by the people. Accordingly, during the eighteenth century, while the Constitution had permanently placed our chief rights in complete safety, and the result was seen in the extraordinary progress of England in power and material wealth, the nation appears as if it had declined in public spirit and lofty thought; a number of gross defects existed in the law, in the Church, and in our subordinate institutions; and the satirist and the moralist found an ample field to ridicule or denounce our manners and vices.

A discriminating review of this period, however, is not to be expected from Mr. Phillimore. His account not only keeps out of sight the general state of contemporary civilisation, but suppresses all that is worthy of admiration, and magnifies all that is of an opposite kind in the England of our great-grandfathers. His picture is simply all wrinkles, and is about as like the original as that drawn by Junius of the Duke of Bedford. He informs us that, 'with the exception of some few among the more educated classes, the nation was sunk into a degree of brutality almost inconceivable.' 'In this respect there was a great contrast in the condition of most European countries;' as for instance, in France, where the peasants ate nettles and were hanged summarily if they made any objection. 'Our annals are a record of murders, robberies, and wanton acts of fiendish cruelty, not exceeded by those which have been transmitted to us as having taken place under the Merovingian dynasty, together with the frauds, chicane, and meanness which are the evils of a more advanced civilisation.' 'It is difficult to find in the history of the most despotic countries in the darkest ages proofs of more stupid and revolting iniquity,' than were seen in the administration of justice by Willes and Ryder, by Holt and Lord Raymond. Our law was 'the worst for its effects upon the temper and morals of the community in civilised Europe,'—worse doubtless than that which tortured Damians, broke Calas and Sirven on the wheel, and, in the caustic words of Voltaire, was too Christian to have any humanity. 'No institution ever tended more directly to social degradation than the poor laws' of this period—not even the serfdom and tailles of France; and the labouring poor in the last century 'were looked upon as the Norman considered the native serf.' Can we wonder that, this being the state of the nation, 'the worst faults of an aristocracy pervaded the upper classes;' that corruption tainted all public men; and that 'the immorality of men and women of condition was so gross and undisguised as to demand all the proofs from various sources in which the evidence of it is established before we can give it credit'? A dissertation on the enormities of the slave trade, which it would seem at this time was confined to England, and on our ignorant treatment of lunatics, completes this sober and candid summary.

We may test the truth of these extravagances by referring to Mr. Phillimore's assertions respecting the state of England at present. According to him, we have only improved superficially since the last century; we are still the same coarse and corrupted race, with a little false lacquer over our deformities;

and in some particulars we have positively retrograded. 'The present age is only great and respectable compared with the period of the Regency, when the tone and habit of the public mind was most vulgar and degraded, when the higher classes were most contemptible, the middle most obsequious, and the feelings of the lower blackest and most ulcerated—the most humiliating period of English story.' Nowadays, perhaps, the method of government is more decorous and subject to opinion than it was in the time of Walpole and Pelham, but the leprosy of corruption is at this hour the blot and scourge of commercial England; and, as it would seem, 'direct bribery' has 'since the Reform Bill' reappeared in the House of Commons. Our institutions have in part been reformed, but the Church is more time-serving and hypocritical than ever. 'The immediate object of Lord Mansfield's successors has been to restore the pettifogging tone and miserable quibbles of our law,' which is still well-nigh as absurd as of old; and even down to 1835, 'the egotism and want of foresight for which our legislation is so conspicuous, were never written in more conspicuous characters.' As for the relations between the orders of society, the lower classes have no doubt improved and are more humanely treated than they were, but the upper have as certainly declined, having 'exchanged the old frank outspoken vices of a plain manly generation for those of priests and courtiers, for superstition and hypocrisy.' And as for the tone of our social life, it is one of mingled ostentation, frivolity, and corruption: respecting virtue, yet worshipping wealth, intensely servile, thoughtless, and selfish, and tainted with vice, though dreading opinion.

No doubt Mr. Phillimore would deny that, as Burke wrote of George Grenville's pamphlet, 'the apparent intention of this author has been to draw the most aggravated, hideous, and deformed picture of the state of the country which querulous eloquence, aided by an arbitrary dominion over fact, was capable of exhibiting!' Intellectually, moreover, we must recollect that we have declined since the last century, and this set-off must be taken into account against any other questionable improvement. A comparison drawn by Mr. Phillimore between the England of Anne and George I. and the England of the last two generations, in point of mental eminence and culture, will show how implicitly we should follow his judgment. 'With Pope, the luminary of its twilight, ceased the age of English poetry for ever,' and that of Byron, Wordsworth, and Teunyson is simply one of poetic nothingness. 'Metaphysics, the queen of sciences, the mistress and architect of materials out of which

'the adamantine basis of morality must be constructed,' was unknown to Coleridge and Sir W. Hamilton, and found its highest exponent in Hume, 'the greatest man born in this island during the last century.' The age of 'the eloquence of Walpole and St. John has been succeeded by a period without it,'—as those who have heard a Brougham, a Macaulay, and a Gladstone will at once acknowledge. Our literature 'is trash which pours like a deluge from the press in every shape,'—as has been exemplified by several of the most important historical works in the language. 'The worst of the pamphlets of the eighteenth century,'—say those of Shebbeare, Oldmixon, and Cibber—'are far superior to anything the present age has produced,'—say the dull letters of Peter Plymley. No wonder, indeed, the decline has been great, for at the Oxford of Adam Smith and of Gibbon, 'those who were instructed with the education of youth' 'taught them to read Homer and Virgil, and Cicero and Euripides, as they were read by Milton and Dryden, by Addison and Barrow, and Atterbury and Fox;' whereas now 'they cram them for examinations, and bring down every mind to the dead tutor's level,'—as Professors G. Smith and Arnold will acknowledge. Nevertheless, though we doubt if this be 'a period in which railways, theological disputes worthy of the Byzantine empire, second-hand scepticism, and schemes for fattening cattle,' have usurped 'the place of those studies which formerly trained some few Englishmen in all times to be most skilful and magnanimous,' we readily admit that 'it has witnessed an impostor who, in spite of incorrect and ludicrous blunders—not master of even a tolerable style—can assume the chair of a critic and dictate magisterially.'

An historical review of the main events of the reign of George I., and George II. completes the series of preliminary essays which fill nearly half of this volume. In this, as in the work throughout, we find the want of insight and depth, and the extravagant and intemperate views of which we have had occasion to complain; and the narrative is clumsy and disconnected, with, here and there, some gross inaccuracies. A thinker, treating this important period, would, probably, dwell especially on the causes which, on the one hand, secured ultimately the triumph of the settlement of the Revolution, and, on the other, retarded for years the extinction of the Jacobite faction. We remember to have heard M. Guizot remark that there is no passage in English history more worthy of note than those reigns, during which the nation submitted to be governed by princes, equally devoid of every accomplishment

and every feeling of Englishmen, provided only it saved in their persons the great principles of constitutional government. Mr. Phillimore, however, disdains to take a philosophical view of any subject, and hurries his readers into mazes of facts, connected only by a commentary of invective, amidst which we lose sight of the real character and tendencies of the period. He may be right in describing George I. as 'ill-educated and narrow-minded' and George II. as an unnatural parent, an unreasonable master, and a selfish man; he is fully justified in saying what he pleases of the Duchess of Kendal and the Countess of Darlington; but what shall we think of the sage remark, 'that the effect of the Revolution was 'to give us a German instead of a French concubine'? We shall not cavil at such violent phrases as 'the venal and interested aristocracy' of the day,—that Walpole 'bribed the nation with its own money to be free.'—and that 'corruption became the mainspring of his government,' but we might have expected that an historian would have pointed out the reason of these phenomena. Nor can we allow that the wise vigour which possibly saved the Hanoverian succession by checking the designs of Alberoni 'was a measure wholly indefensible,' that 'Walpole deserved to be the almost sole counsellor of the 'House of Brunswick,' that Queen Caroline's 'posterity owe to 'her the throne of England,' or that the war of 1739 'began in 'wickedness and ended in disgrace,'—expressions which are quite in keeping with Mr. Phillimore's most sober moments.

The special fault of this chapter, however, is the abuse Mr. Phillimore lavishes on the character and administration of Stanhope, and the way he contrasts that statesman with Walpole. It may well be that 'the noble flame' of the brave soldier and brilliant diplomatist was not so suited to the meridian of that time as the calm sagacity of his fortunate successor. But the minister who thwarted the schemes of Alberoni, and secured the alliance of France with England during the first years of the reign of George I., cannot 'be said 'to have acquired power to bring the nation to the verge of 'ruin,' unless indeed Mr. Phillimore believes that the cause of Jacobitism was that of England. The thinker who tried to anticipate his age by a liberal measure of religious toleration did not 'brand his administration with lasting infamy,' or, perhaps, in the judgment of this generation, 'employ power to 'assail the Constitution.' As for the 'baseness and dishonesty' of Stanhope's conduct, in intriguing to 'disgrace' Walpole, Mr. Phillimore, blindly following Coxe, appears not to have read the evidence collected by Stanhope's accomplished successor

in a work very different from that before us. The Peerage Bill, brought in by Stanhope, and opposed by Walpole for party purposes, was, doubtless, a very short-sighted measure, and possibly 'at no distant time might have brought about a revolution;' but when Mr. Phillimore makes it the ground for denouncing its author and lauding its antagonist, he might have mentioned the reason of its introduction—the sudden creation of the twelve peers—and the real character of Walpole's opposition. As for the 'South Sea scheme,' it is idle to lay a misfortune to the charge of Stanhope which was really a national and Parliamentary folly; and it is very remarkable that though Walpole opposed it—as he had opposed every measure of the administration—he had actually, before the bubble burst, accepted a subordinate office from Stanhope, thus, tacitly at least, acquiescing in the project. Nor should it be forgotten in comparing these statesmen, that if Walpole's wise and provident policy assured the throne to the House of Brunswick, it was, especially in its foreign alliances, the same in the main as that which his predecessor had inaugurated at a most critical juncture. It really is as correct to say that Stanhope's administration was 'base and treacherous,' as it is to assert the extraordinary 'fact,' which we learn for the first time from Mr. Phillimore, that the treaty of Hanover, made in 1725, was 'an alliance between *Russia*, France, and England.'

'Lo, lo, lo, what modicums of wit he utters, his evasions 'have ears thus long,' we exclaim, as we reach the preface of the narrative proper of this history. In a sentence which takes up five pages, Mr. Phillimore gives us a rapid sketch of the reign of George III. as a whole, in which his pessimism becomes a rhapsody of despair. Having made up his mind that this period was one of national disgrace and decline, Mr. Phillimore weaves the facts of the case into a 'preestablished harmony' of nonsense, from which truth and reason are learnedly excluded. This method consists in huddling together and placing in the worst possible light every circumstance which bears out the theory; in drawing upon a distempered imagination; and in sedulously keeping out of view the facts which tell on the opposite side of the question.

A just review of this momentous era would probably conclude that though its course was in parts dark, chequered, and troubled, it was one, on the whole, of glory to the empire, of progress among large classes of the nation, and of happy augury for the coming generation. We lost America by folly and oppression, but we consolidated our rule over three fourths of India, and laid the foundations of a still more extended colonial Empire.

If we engaged in perilous wars which might have been averted by wisdom, we emerged unscathed or victors from them. If the opening of the reign of George III. beheld the last effort of unconstitutional prerogative, and, during the long reactionary period which followed the outbreak of the French Revolution, the Government of England was harsh and unenlightened, and reform was stopped in all parts of the State, our polity and our cardinal institutions proved sound under the severest trials, and when restored to their normal state, showed readily how they could be improved, and quickly again became popular. Though under the strain of internecine war the burdens of the people were enormous, and there were many occasions of local distress, the wealth of the nation increased on a scale to which history affords no parallel, except during our own generation. And though, undoubtedly, this period was not free from disaffection and rebellion, and Power, during a part of its course, was in opposition to growing intelligence, and entrenched itself in sullen Conservatism, still the nation, on the whole, was loyal and contented, and in all the spheres of mental activity exhibited fruitful and splendid effects. If we compare the England of 1760 with the England of 1820, we shall hardly doubt that, although she passed through a crisis of tremendous peril, her fortunes were still in the ascendant; that in grandeur, wealth, institutions, government, and in the achievements of the mind of man, the nation had made a marked advance, and was giving a glorious promise for the future.

Mr. Phillimore, however, lifts up his voice to protest against these conclusions. 'The reign of George III.,' he informs us, 'was overcast with clouds and beset with darkness; it was a scene of gloom, discontent, and confusion.' The increase of our empire he describes as 'the East won by fraud and violence,' omitting quietly our colonial acquisitions; and our struggle with Napoleon is characterised as 'triumphs by sea—by land, calamities.' Not a word is said of the terrible emergency which so long established Toryism in the State, and checked political and social reform, though we hear a good deal about 'the decay of public spirit,' the 'servility of the senate,' and the 'illiberality of government.' It may be true that in parts of this reign there were 'prerogative judges, unjustifiable prosecutions, iniquitous verdicts, and cruel sentences,' that 'the Church returned to her ancient intolerance,' that there was 'mutiny in our fleet and revolt in our dependencies;' but it might have been added that the French Revolution inevitably caused a reaction against all change, and that, after all, the institutions of Great Britain alone survived the shock of the

tempest. We hear that 'taxes increased beyond example,' and that 'the transition from an agricultural to a merely commercial and manufacturing people became every year more marked,' but we find nothing about the augmentation of the wealth that made increased taxation bearable, nor yet of the wonderful expansion of industry which carried us through our mortal struggle. It is undoubtedly true that 'rebellion in Ireland was provoked by oppression and avenged by cruelty,' and 'that the Union was purchased by corruption,' but Mr. Phillimore omits to notice the benefits the Union has conferred upon the empire, and the still more liberal and enlightened views with which it was conceived by Mr. Pitt. As for the social and intellectual life of the period of Burke and Johnson, of Scott and Byron, as for the philosophical and scientific triumphs of the age of Coleridge and Horner, of Black and Davy, and as for the tone of the House of Commons of Pitt and Fox, of Brougham and Romilly, it is novel, doubtless, to be informed 'that all sense of things moral and intellectual diminished rapidly,' that 'taste and literature fell into decay,' that there was 'little manliness of character and independence of thought,' that 'the pursuit of wealth was almost the only indication that any power of thought remained among us,' and 'that the intellect employed in public life dwindled into mediocrity and servility.' But novelty will not make nonsense interesting. In short, between suppression and exaggeration, one-sided views and rhetorical bombast, this sketch of the whole subject is one of the most offensive and unreadable parts of this history.

Mr. Phillimore's narrative of the reign of George III. embraces only the brief period from the accession of the King to 1766, when Chatham formed his second Administration. Like every other part of the volume, it is full of extravagance and silly vehemence, and it is quite devoid of the life and skill which reflect and reproduce the spirit of an epoch. As is well known, the character and tendencies of this interesting yet disagreeable time have been depicted by two great masters, by Burke in his 'Thoughts on the present Discontents,' and by Lord Macaulay in this *Journal*. Without presuming to repeat their lessons, we may say that the outset of the reign of George III. was marked by two peculiar phenomena—the attempt of a subtle and sinister prerogative to overthrow the balance of the Constitution, and the ultimate failure of that attempt, though not without a disastrous struggle, and under very unfavourable circumstances. Ascending the throne amidst a fervour of loyalty which had not been witnessed since the days of Queen Anne, and trained in perilous lessons of king-craft, unfitted to a limited monarchy,



George III. persistently made use of his position to reconcile the predominance of his rule with the action of constitutional government, and to arrogate to himself the substance of power without violently assailing our polity. How, with this illegitimate end in view, he struggled to emasculate the independence of Parliament by sapping the bonds of party connexion, to deprive the House of Commons of the control it possesses over the executive directly by vesting in an irresponsible Camarilla the power that is due to responsible Ministers, and, through extravagant and skilful corruption, to convert into an instrument of the Crown the assembly which should be its principal regulator, must be known to our readers generally. Undoubtedly, to a certain extent, these evil designs were carried out by the King; and we see their operation in the feeble governments, upheld by the sovereign against the people, and depending upon distracted Parliaments, which marked the opening years of this reign, in the ascendancy of Lord Bute and 'the King's friends,' and in the sudden and perilous development of the influence of the royal will upon the destiny and policy of England. The results were the Peace of Paris, the Stamp Act, the prosecution of Wilkes, the Middlesex election, the '*sæva indignatio*' of a people expressed in the '*Letters of Junius*,' the American war, and the dismemberment of the empire.

The king-craft, however, of George III., and his attempt at compassing illegitimate power, were only very partially successful. Even in that age of unreformed parliaments, and when public opinion was very weak, the institutions and temper of the nation were strong enough to withstand the influences of the new mode of oblique despotism. This, we venture to think, is the real lesson to be derived from the study of that time—a lesson which shows that while the Revolution had placed our polity beyond a direct attack, the exercise of the rights it had conferred had secured that polity from indirect invasion, and, under very unfavourable conditions, had made it dear to the hearts of Englishmen. George III., before he had reigned three years, had found that a Ministry of his exclusive choice would not be tolerated even by the Parliament which had been corrupted by Henry Fox, and from the first the influence of the 'King's friends' was odious to all ranks of the nation. Shortly after he had heard that he was '*really a king*,' he was forced to sanction the measures of men whom he hated with an insane hatred; and though throughout his long reign he was often able to thwart the policy of statesmen superior to his own views, this never happened unless he had a strong ally in popular prejudices. His attempt

to break up the party ties which form the strongest of our Parliamentary securities, only ended in the victory of the opposition which overthrew Lord North with disgrace, and in the dominant government of Mr. Pitt, in whom he found a parliamentary master. As for the cabal of 'King's friends,' it soon disappeared as a force in politics; and though by corrupting the House of Commons he was enabled powerfully to affect our policy and to appropriate by far too much power, the national representation even in that age obeyed ultimately the national voice, and declared against him when enjoined to do so. Indeed, had not the French Revolution produced a strong reaction in England, it is probable that the efforts of George III. to increase the influence of the Crown in the State would have led to a sweeping Reform Bill, and assuredly made the 'King's Government' more amenable than before to the will of the people. In short, the last struggle of prerogative in England, though not without calamitous effects, was impotent against the steady forces which the Constitution had arrayed against it, even when they were comparatively weak and ill-organised.

The features of this period, however, do not appear in this wild narrative. Mr. Phillimore cannot arrange his facts in accordance with their real relations; he invariably jumbles them crudely together, their only connexion being continuous invective. Thus no prominence is given to the causes which, at the accession of George III., extended suddenly the influence of the Crown, though a writer who understood this juncture would, assuredly, dwell especially on this subject. We read plainly enough that the King was 'an ignorant, dishonest, obstinate, and narrow-minded boy,' and that he would have contented himself 'with strict and absolute submission to his will in 'Church and State;' but we obtain no insight into the subtle means by which this end was to be accomplished. There is much scandal about the Princess Dowager and Lord Bute, who, it seems, had a rival in Lord Talbot—an assertion resting on the merest gossip; but no stress is laid on the unconstitutional error of abusing the authority of the Crown in making a worthless favourite Minister. Encomiums of Pitt, denunciations of the 'King's friends,' condemnations of the Peace of Paris and the Stamp Act, and vituperation of the packed Parliaments which lent themselves to these unfortunate measures, are crowded thickly enough in these pages; but the reader is never afforded a view of the peculiar policy which effected these results, and of the circumstances that made it successful. That Bute was forced to resign for Grenville, that Grenville dictated his terms to the King, that the Rockingham Cabinet

succeeded Grenville and was replaced by the Ministry of Chatham, that the King was all through pursuing his game of frequently changing his administrations, and that the nation was suspicious and irritated, and the House of Commons not always obsequious, is of course chronicled in fiery language; but the real significance of these facts as indicating a struggle between prerogative and the Constitution, the importance of which can hardly be overrated, is hardly brought out, or indeed appreciated. Mr. Phillimore, no doubt, while this drama is going on, is ever, in his wonted Pistol vein, abusing the King and everybody else; but it would have been better had he described the tendencies of this period clearly, and gravely censured the author of its perils, than to have taken vengeance on George III. by describing his bride as 'repulsive in her aspect, grovelling in her instincts, and sordid in her habits'—expressions hardly worthy of a political history.

Mr. Phillimore, however, is most true to himself in his account of the legal proceedings in the case of Wilkes and the general warrants. These trials, we think, attest signally the impartial character of our jurisprudence, and the pure administration of British justice. Wilkes, infamous libeller as he was, and the special object of the hatred of the King, proved nevertheless, in the legal contest which he waged with the Crown in Westminster Hall, that our law and its ministers could stand indifferent between Royalty and the vilest of its subjects. When arrested for libel under a general warrant, Wilkes was at once discharged without bail, though the law on the point was not perfectly clear, and the Court must have known that his incarceration would have given the greatest pleasure to the Government. Having brought an action for false imprisonment against one of the King's messengers, he recovered a thousand pounds damages; and Lord Camden went even out of his way to protect the verdict from further criticism. Other persons who, like Wilkes, had been imprisoned, obtained damages in the Court of King's Bench, and on solemn argument the Court expressed an opinion against the legality of the arrest, and of the warrant on which it was founded, though it was well known that the King took the deepest personal interest in the issue. It is true that Wilkes, having been outlawed for not appearing to two criminal informations, was disabled from prosecuting an action against Lord Halifax, the Secretary of State who signed the warrant; but this was strictly in accordance with law—and founded upon the rational principle that the suitor who seeks must submit to justice;—and it should be added, that shortly afterwards the self-imposed impediment was removed, the out-

lawry having been reversed upon the merest technical informality. The historian who describes these proceedings might surely ascribe some merit to the law which was so equal, and fairly administered; and might point out how fortunate was the country whose 'constitution,' in Lord Mansfield's words, 'allowed no reasons of State whatever to influence the judgment' of its tribunals.

Mr. Phillimore, however, takes no notice of the moral aspect of these trials; indeed he steadily puts it out of view; and 'he dwells at length' on the case of Wilkes for the sole purpose of coining invectives against 'our slovenly and short-sighted jurisprudence'! Omitting, or passing rapidly over, the lesson taught by the remarkable spectacle of Wilkes's repeated triumphs over the Crown, and actually insinuating that the conduct of the House of Commons contrasted favourably with that of the judges, as regards the persecution of Wilkes, he fastens upon the solitary fact that Wilkes was disabled from suing Lord Halifax, in consequence of the outlawry against him, and he summarily denounces the entire proceedings as 'a jargon of nonsense' and cruel oppression! We quote his review of the whole subject, as a specimen of his criticism:—

'Such was English justice, such was the boasted impartiality of its proceedings towards rich and poor; such was the state to which the law had been brought by the venality, ignorance, and incorrigible pedantry of those to whom the English blindly assigned the making of it; and while—in spite, literally speaking, of the evidence of their senses—the inhabitants of this island, always the ready slaves of trivial phrases, vaunted on all occasions the wisdom and humanity of the shapeless heap of ferocious rules and absurd customs, expressed, as the note in the preceding page shows, in a most hideous and brutish jargon; to which so long as certain sounds were repeated in their ears by men dressed in a certain manner, they were content, like irrational animals, blindly to submit.'

This tirade is a fair example of Mr. Phillimore in his best moments:

'Verba devolvit, numerisque fertur  
Lege solutis.'

In the same strain Mr. Phillimore devotes two long episodes to Ireland and to India which might have been written, as far as any British feeling is concerned, by Mr. Smith O'Brien and by Nana Sahib. Mr. Phillimore's view of the Irish question is based upon the two false assumptions that the English race are incapable of empire, and have been actuated by a blind hatred of the Irish in all their relations with them,—an hypothesis which, it has been judiciously remarked, 'is morally absurd and historically

'untenable.' As these principles are made to explain the whole history of Ireland from its conquest, it is needless to say that Mr. Phillimore's view is a mere perversion of truth and reality. No allowance is made for the peculiar circumstances under which Ireland was conquered and colonised, and for the consequences of the unfortunate severance of the two nations at the crisis of the Reformation; no account, in weighing the tale of wrong, is taken of provocations given to the conqueror, or of the effects of national passion; all is set down to the dull stupidity and 'shameless oppression' of the English nation. The tyrannical statutes of the Conventions of the Pale, which separated the Irishry from the Norman noblesse, are proofs of English incapacity for government! The religious wars of the sixteenth century, which identified Ireland with the Catholic cause, were simply the result of English atrocities! The Penal Code, the work of Irish Protestants, enacted in a moment of terror, is made a proof 'of English insatiation'! No candid writer would wish to dispute the wrongs done by England to Ireland, any more than he should try to conceal the circumstances which unfortunately produced them; but history will hardly agree with Mr. Phillimore, that 'oppression, exhibited in a form more *'shameless than it has ever displayed among European nations,'* is the whole truth respecting the relations between this country and her Celtic sister.

As regards India, Mr. Phillimore's review is quite as absurd and unworthy of an historian. It is borrowed, in part, from French writers—not unnaturally jealous of our supremacy and eager to exaggerate our misdeeds—and, in part, from the rhetoric of Burke; but it overflows with original bombast and vehemence. As in Ireland the English nature was 'oppressive,' so in India it has been 'incessantly treacherous;' and Mr. Phillimore, who refuses to 'shout with the herd in the train of prosperous injustice,' constructs his chapter upon this theory. Here, again, no consideration is taken of the circumstances of our Indian conquests—of the dangers incurred by Asiatic guile and the necessary severity of a new domination;—we hear nothing of the barbarous anarchy in which India had sunk when it came into our hands; the picture before us is that of an empire of antique civilisation and wealth overrun by a horde of crafty plunderers. Quite in keeping with this rational view, Dupleix is always 'generous and profound;' Surajah Dowlah was not guilty of the tragedy of the Blackhole at Calcutta; Omichund was simply an injured innocent; in founding an empire at the battle of Plassey Clive 'was influenced mainly by disgusting rapacity,' and, as a climax, 'the protection of the Englishman has been

'worse than the pillage of the Mahratta'! In fact, before the English name had been heard of 'in the Italy of the East,' the 'ancient government of Hindostan was a model of beauty, 'purity, piety, regularity, and equity,' where tyranny and misery, idolatry and crime, had not defaced 'the golden age,' and peace and plenty covered the land; but a change came over this region of delights with the advent of 'the ravenous and wolfish race;' and now India is half a desert 'under the savage government 'of iron-hearted monopolists;' and 'the ryot in the land of his fathers has only just been emancipated from the yoke of 'the most contracted, ignoble, and sordidly selfish rulers that 'ever disregarded the happiness of their subjects'! We wonder the Company was not charged with the customs of caste and of Indian tenures, with Indian justice and Indian taxation, with the rite of Suttee and the worship of Juggernaut.

We had intended to cite a few more illustrations of the extravagance and inaccuracies of this book,—as, for instance, that 'the 'aristocracy' of our day 'make the employments of grooms, 'gamekeepers, and watermen and drill-serjeants, the serious 'and almost the sole objects of their children's education;' that 'Charles the First *directly* fomented the Irish rebellion;' that '*Grenville in his decrepitude* played the game of Bute;' and that 'general warrants made no attempt to define the 'offence;' but probably our readers will have had enough of this tissue of weak inpetuosity and exaggeration. As for its style and language, though Mr. Phillimore professes to write 'the sound idiomatic English of which so few traces now 'remain,' the vicious taste of contemporary critics who 'have 'forgotten the art of composition and exchanged classical taste 'for mere philology and a laborious erudition,' will probably agree that florid impotence was never more amusingly clothed 'in harsh, rugged, and inaccurate idioms.' It is not only that the arrangement is bad, that the diction is wild, inharmonious, and flashy—that many sentences baffle the reader from their length—that false metaphors, disagreeable conceits, and strained expressions occur repeatedly—but occasionally periods are so involved that grammar seems to be bravely neglected. Some passages, indeed, irresistibly remind us of the conversation of the Squire in 'Paul Clifford,' whose 'parenthetical habit of 'speech' made such chasms in his broken sentences that the initiated only could understand them.

In conclusion, we must acknowledge that we can find no merit whatever in this book to set off against its faults and absurdities. Except two or three little bits of gossip, which are hardly worthy of a place in history, we have not met

with any new facts as we toiled along the strange region of wild views and uncouth sights into which Mr. Phillimore has led us. Perhaps in collecting a medley of paradoxes, which not only assail the deliberate judgment of all who have used the same evidence, but wanton in indiscriminate abuse of much that the nation loves and reveres, Mr. Phillimore may have thought, with Tacitus, 'that detraction and spite are always listened to;' and may have hoped that these arts at least would make this singular production popular. But we have no doubt that his estimate of his own powers will turn out to be as inaccurate as the judgments he has passed on his country are unsound.

ART. IX.—*Tara: A Mahratta Tale.* By Captain MEADOWS TAYLOR. Author of 'The Confessions of a Thug.' 3 vols. Edinburgh: 1863.

A QUARTER of a century and a generation of novel-readers have almost passed away, since we have had the pleasure of meeting the author of 'The Confessions of a Thug' in the field of Indian adventure; yet, we may venture to assume that his first book is not forgotten, and that his last book will take rank beside it. Both of them belong to that class of works in which there is more of reality than of imagination, and the structure of these tales serves chiefly to introduce the reader to life-like pictures of the manners and character of the people of India. This long interval of time has been spent by Captain Taylor in the service of that people, as one of the Commissioners of the Western ceded districts of the Deccan. Few Englishmen have left behind them in India a more honourable reputation; for in addition to the not uncommon merit of successful administration in a large territory, it has been Captain Taylor's good fortune to endear himself to the population, to penetrate the native character in all its phases, and to live amongst the mingled races of Southern India as one of themselves. In this respect his career has widely differed from the dominant character of Indian civilians—a class to which he did not belong: and it is probably due to this cause that he writes of India, and the natives of India, with a degree of spirit, truth, and genuine sympathy hardly to be met with in any other English author.

It is, no doubt, a difficult task for a novelist to overcome the indifference or repulsion which are apt to chill the description of manners and occurrences unlike anything in our own expe-

rience. The interest of fictitious characters, or even of the real personages of history, depends mainly on the sympathy they excite in ourselves. It is not enough that they should gratify our curiosity, if they fail to touch our hearts. The difficulty of exciting these feelings of interest is enormously increased, when the incidents which occur, and the feelings they excite, are extremely foreign to our own lives. But Captain Taylor has a singular power of transporting his reader to the scenes he wishes to describe; and like the scenery of the theatre, the decorations of his tale powerfully contribute to the general illusion. In spite, therefore, of the remoteness of the scene, and the peculiarity of many of the incidents, 'Tara' is not wanting in human interest, and we have great pleasure in introducing her to our readers. Take, for example, the following simple passage, which conveys a sentiment everyone has often experienced, yet throws it upon an Indian background, skilfully indicated by little details of country life in a strange land:—

'There is nothing, perhaps, more effectual to deaden, if not to relieve recent misery, than the sensation of rapid motion. Leaning back in the palankeen, with the doors now shut, and the fresh breeze blowing refreshingly through the open blinds, Tara felt herself hurried swiftly and smoothly along, while her attention was at once occupied and distracted by the occurrences of the journey. Sindphul, its temple and trees: the lane which was the bed of the rivulet, through which the bearers plashed rapidly: the village gate now shut, and its bastions manned with men to keep out marauders: the long shady narrow lane, overhung with trees;—then, beyond, the plain, covered with rich crops of grain now ripening: the shouts of the men and boys, perched upon their stages in the fields, slinging stones at birds: the song, drawling and monotonous, of the bullock-drivers at the wells—were all familiar objects and sounds to the desolate girl being carried rapidly by them. Would she ever see them again?' (Vol. iii. p. 1.)

Captain Taylor excels in the introduction of these small touches of manners and habits of life, which give the stamp of reality to his narrative. This is precisely the faculty which places Defoe and Lesage at the head of all writers of fiction: had the art been invented in their time, they might have been called the photographers of romance: nothing is so small as to escape their nice observation; nothing so strange as not to fall naturally into its place. To approach at all to this mirror-like reflection of truth is the highest aim of such composition; even the structure of the tale is of secondary importance, at least upon a second reading. We have been extremely struck, upon a minute and critical examination, with the multitude of varied



impressions and allusions to be found in these pages—the more remarkable as they refer respectively to two entirely different races and different creeds, which are never confounded though perpetually mixed.

The native aspect of India is like a 'shot' stuff, the warp and woof being of different colours. Wide over the realm still spread the ancient race, the ancient superstition, the ancient tongues, which were, as far as we can tell, the same as now they are, at the dawn of history. If there be anything immutable on earth, it is the law of caste, which has for so many ages bound this large section of mankind in its bonds of iron. Over this broad surface, Mahomedan conquest and British dominion have successively borne sway; and as the descendants of the Mahomedan conquerors are not less genuine natives of India than the Hindoos themselves, the juxtaposition of the two religions gives rise to the most singular combinations, destined as they are to coexist in one political community, though eternally divided by laws, manners, traditions, and faith. The romance of Indian history is comparatively absent from the vast plains and enervating climate of Bengal, where nature herself seems to have prepared men to obey, rather than to rule. But it is otherwise in the mountain districts of Southern India, extending to the Western coast, and through the whole of Maharashtra—the Mahratta country. The Deccan was the seat of those splendid viceroalties which bore an imperfect allegiance to the Mogul at Delhi. The dominant race was the Mohammedan, but even the Hindoo people were warlike; and it was there that the Mahratta Empire of Sivajee (if so it can be called) took its origin, and the fanaticism and treachery of the followers of the goddess Bhowanee triumphed over the far more enlightened faith and the far more civilised administration of the followers of the Prophet. As 1857 was the date of the great Indian mutiny, and 1757 was the date of the origin of the British Indian rule, so 1657 was the year which saw the rise of the Mahratta power. Sivajee had then matured the schemes which he had long been plotting against the King of Beejapoor, and even against the authority of Aurungzebe; the rising was accompanied by mysterious marks of the favour of the savage divinity of the Mahratta creed; and the old war-cry of the Mahrattas was once more heard, and not heard in vain:—'Hur, Hur, Mahadeo, Dônguras lavilé Déva,' 'Oh! Mahadeo! the fire has lit the hills.'

This is the epoch at which Captain Taylor has placed the action of his tale. The events he has woven into it with fidelity may be traced in Duff's 'History of the Mahrattas,' or

in the garrulous pages of Orme; but the history of the native Indian States is apt to leave so little trace upon the memory, that the course of these occurrences, sanguinary and romantic as they were, will probably be new to the great majority of English readers. Moro Trimmul, Tannajee Maloosray, who are amongst the chief personages of this tale, still live in Mahratta tradition as the leading followers of Sivajee Bhoslay—and the fame of Pahar Singh, the robber chief who took service in the Mahratta cause, is borne in memory to this day by his descendants. This freebooter is one of the best drawn characters in the book, and in spite of his lawless life and numerous crimes, he does good service to the young King of Beejapoor, who has reason, in a memorable adventure, to grant him a free pardon. Captain Taylor affirms that a descendant of the original Pahar Singh figured in the Mahratta war of 1818–19, and subsequently took to highway robbery. Ten years later the family were found to be engaged in Dacoity and Thuggee, and it was not till 1850 that the gang was hunted down, and the last six of them brought to justice by the writer of this tale. It is thus that in India, where nothing perishes or fades entirely from sight, the ingenious author has evidently traced, from types familiar to himself, the personages of a by-gone time. The same might, till recently, have been done in Spain—for Spain is semi-Oriental: in Northern Europe each generation effaces the track of its precursors.

Tara, the heroine of the tale, is at once presented to the reader in circumstances of great singularity—a maiden of the highest caste, sole daughter of Vyas Shastree, one of the most accomplished pundits of the great Temple of Bhowanee at Tooljapoor, but at the same time a widow, by reason of the death of the child-husband to whom she had been betrothed in infancy. The law of caste consigns women in that predicament either to a life of asceticism, or to the priesthood,—which is too often a life of infamy,—for they cannot marry again, and even the Suttee was in some cases a merciful termination of their miserable and forlorn existence. Tara, in a paroxysm of religious enthusiasm, supposed to be inspired by the goddess Kalee herself, becomes a priestess or Morlee: but she sustains the purity of her sacred vocation; and her adventures form the ostensible subject of these volumes. We say, ostensible, because, graceful and interesting as she is, upon the whole we prefer the varied scenes of native life, in which she does not always play a part; and the utmost ingenuity cannot entirely surmount the difficulties of the extraordinary position in which she stands. It is obvious that when, to the ordinary contingencies of love

and war, the old staple of romance writers in all lands, are added the perplexities arising out of the laws and obligations of caste; a series of questions arises which would puzzle the casuistry of a Jesuit. Tara is the child of her faith until she becomes its victim: and on the brink of the most frightful sacrifice, she is snatched away to pass without violence, but rather by necessity, into a purer creed. It is impossible to read this book, in which the native heathenism of India is portrayed side by side with the institutions of Mohammedan society in the Deccan, without feeling that Mohammedanism was an enormous advance on the foul superstition which stained the altars of Tooljapoor with blood, and sanctioned every act of perfidy and crime. The outbreak of the Mahrattas in the seventeenth century destroyed what was then the existing civilisation of India: and the period which elapsed from the decline of the Empire of Aurungzebe to the rise of the British power, is the darkest æra in the modern annals of Hindostan.

We shall not attempt to trace the fate of Captain Taylor's heroine, and we purposely abstain from marring the interest which attends the first perusal of so attractive a tale. We select rather as a specimen of the work a remarkable episode, complete in itself, and admirably described; though the events themselves are, we think, strictly taken from the Mahratta chronicles. The state of things is this. The young King of Beejapoor, Ali Adil Shah, apprised of the machinations of Sivajee and of his preparations for revolt, sends a considerable army to invest the fortress of Pertabgurh, then the chief stronghold of the Mahratta prince. The first act of the campaign had been to desecrate and destroy the shrine of Bhowanee at Tooljapoor, an act of Mohammedan intolerance which had kindled to madness the passions of the Mahrattas. This force is commanded by Afzool Khan, one of the ablest and most faithful servants of the Mohammedan court. Sivajee, aware that he had no means of opposing the advance of the royal troops, resorts to artifice. He feigns entire submission to the will of the king, whilst in his own fastnesses he inflames to madness the passions of the Hindu people. Afzool Khan is drawn on by specious promises, and at length a conference between himself and Sivajee is proposed—each to be unarmed and unattended save by one follower—at which 'Rajah Sivajee is to throw himself at the feet of the envoy of the king of kings, and receive the pardon he desires.' The Mahommedan general accedes to the treacherous request, and the following chapter relates what befell in that memorable interview:—

'The morning broke, calm and beautiful. Long before the highest peaks of the mountains blushed under the rosy light which preceded the sunrise, the Khan and Fazil, with Zyna [his son and daughter], had risen and performed their morning prayer. The deep booming sound of the kettle-drums woke the echoes around, reverberated from side to side of the valley, retiring to recesses among the glens, and murmuring softly as it died away among the distant peaks and precipices. As yet, the valley was partially filled with mists, which clung to its wooded sides; but as the sun rose, a slight wind sprang up with it, which, breaking through these mists, drove them up the mountain, and displayed the scenery in all its fresh morning beauty, as though a curtain had been suddenly drawn from before it.

'Behind them were the stupendous mountains of the Mahabuleshwur range; before, at a short distance, and divided from them by a chain of smaller hills, rose up the precipices of Pertabgurrh, glittering in the morning light, and crowned by the walls and bastions of the fortress.

'Long before daylight the lady Lurlee had risen, and, careful for her husband, had, in conjunction with Kurreeema, cooked his favourite dish of kichéri and kabobs. "It was a light breakfast," she said, "and would agree with them better than a heavier repast, and dinner would be ready when they returned." So Afzool Khan, his son, and the priest, ate their early meal, not only in joyful anticipation of a speedy return, but of accomplishing what would result in honour to all concerned.

'They remembered afterwards, that as an attendant brought before the Khan the usual mail shirt he wore, and the mail cap, with its bright steel chains, over which his turban was usually tied when fully accoutred, he laughingly declined both. "They will be very hot and uncomfortable," he said, "and we are not going to fight. No, give me a muslin dress," which he put on. A few words about ordinary household matters to Lurlee, a few cheering sentences to Zyna, as he passed from the inner and private enclosure of the tent, and he went out among the men.

'Fazil followed, fully armed and accoutred for riding. There had been a good-humoured strife between Fazil and the priest the night before, as to who should be the one armed follower to accompany his father, and he had chosen the priest. "Fazil was too young yet," he said, "to enter into grave political discussions with wily Mahrattas, and would be better with the escort." So the soldier-priest, like the Khan, discarding the steel cap, gauntlets, and quilted armour in which he usually accoutred himself, appeared, like Afzool Khan, in the plain muslin dress of his order; and having tied up his waist with a shawl, and thrown another over his shoulders, stuck a light court sword into his waistband, which he pressed down on his hips with a jaunty air, and called merrily to Fazil, to see how peacefully he was attired.

'The escort awaited them in camp, and the spirited horses of fifteen hundred gallant cavaliers were neighing and tossing their heads as Afzool Khan, Fazil, and the priest rode up. "Forward!" cried the

Khan cheerily ; and as the kettle-drums beat a march, the several officers saluted their commander, and, wheeling up their men, led them by the road pointed out by the Bramhuns and guides in the direction of Pertabgurh.

'At that time, single men, who looked like shepherds tending sheep, and who were standing on crests of the hills, or crouching so as not to be seen, passed a signal that the Khan and his party had set out. It was still early, and the time when, of all others perhaps, armies such as the Khan's were most defenceless. Many, roused for a while by the assembly and departure of the escort, had gone to sleep again; others, sitting over embers of fires, were smoking, preparing to cook their morning repast, or were attending to their horses, or in the bazar purchasing the materials for their day's meal. The camp was watched from the woods around by thousands of armed men, who, silently and utterly unobserved, crept over the crests of the hills, and lay down in the thick brushwood which fringed the plain.

'As the Khan's retinue neared the fort, parties of armed men, apparently stationed by the roadside to salute him as he passed, closed up in rear of the escort ; and others, moving parallel to them in the thickets, joined with them unseen. Quickly, too, men with axes felled large trees, which were thrown down so as to cross the road, and interlace their branches so as to be utterly impassable for horsemen ; and all these preparations went on in both places silently, methodically, and with a grim surety of success, imparting a confidence which all who remembered it afterwards attributed to the direction of the Goddess whom they worshipped. As it was said then, as it is still said, and sung in many a ballad, "not a man's hand failed, not a foot stumbled."

'At the gate of the fort the Khan dismounted from his horse, and entered his palankeen. Before he did so, however, he embraced his son, and bid him be careful of the men, and that no one entered the town or gave offence. He could see, looking up, the thatched pavilion on the little level shoulder of the mountain, and pointed to it cheerfully. "It is not far to go, Huzrut," he said to the Peer, "I may as well walk with these good friends," and he pointed to the Bramhuns who attended him. But Fazil would not allow it, nor the Peer either. "You must go in state," they said, "as the representative of the King ought to do," and he then took his seat in the litter.

"Khoda Hafiz—may God protect you, father!" said Fazil, as he bent his head into the palankeen, when the bearers took it up ; "come back happily, and do not delay!"

"Inshalla!" said the Khan smilingly, "fear not, I will not delay, and thou canst watch me up yonder." So he went on, the priest's hand leaning upon the edge of the litter as he walked by its side.

'On through the town, from the terraced houses of which, crowds of women looked down on the little procession, and men, mostly unarmed, or unremarkable in any case, saluted them, or regarded them with clownish curiosity. No one could see that the court of

every house behind, was filled with armed men thirsting for blood, and awaiting the signal to attack.

'The Khan's agent, Puntjee Gopinath, being a fat man, had left word at the gate which defended the entrance of the road to the fort, that he had preceded the Khan, and would await him at the pavilion. He had seen no one since the night before, and he knew only that the Khan would come to meet the Rajah. That was all he had stipulated for, and his part was performed. He believed that Sivaji would seize Afzool Khan, and hold him a hostage for the fulfilment of all his demands; and the line of argument in his own mind was, that if the Khan resisted, and was hurt in the fray which might ensue, it was no concern of his. But he did not know the Rajah's intention, nor did the Rajah's two Bramhuns who had ascended with him; and they all three now sat down together upon the knoll, waiting the coming of Afzool Khan from below, and the Rajah from above.

'As the agreement had specified, except one each, there were to be no armed men: no other people were present but one, who seemed to be a labourer, who was tying up a rough mat to the side of the pavilion to keep out the wind and sun. Gopinath looked from time to time up the mountain-road, and again down to the town, speculating upon the cause of delay in the Rajah's coming; and the others told him he would not leave the fort till the Khan had arrived below, and showed him a figure standing upon the edge of the large bastion which overhung the precipice above, relieved sharply against the clear sky, which was fronting towards the quarter by which the Khan's retinue should come, and apparently giving signals to others behind him.

'“Your master is coming,” said the Secretary, “they see him from above;” and, almost as he spoke, the bright glinting of steel caps and lanceheads, with a confused mass of horsemen, appeared on the road to the fort, among the trees, and they sat and watched them come on. Then the force halted in the open space before the outer gate, where the Khan's little procession formed, and entered the town. After that, the houses and the trees of the mountain-side concealed them. How beautiful was the scene!

'The wind had died away, and the sun shone with a blaze of heat unknown elsewhere, striking down among those moist narrow valleys with a power which would have been painful, but for the cool refreshing air by which it was tempered. The distant mountains glowed under the effect of the trembling exhalations, which, rising now unseen, tempered the colours of the distance to that tender blue and grey which melts into the tint of the sky. The rugged precipices above were softened in effect; and the heavy musses of foliage, festoons of creepers, and the dense woods, rich in colour, combined to enhance the wonderful beauty of the spot. There was perfect silence, except the occasional monotonous drumming notes of woodpeckers in the glens, and the shrill chirrup of tree-cricket which occasionally broke out and was again silent.

'In a few minutes, the shouts of the Khan's palankeen-bearers were.

heard below, and the litter suddenly emerged from a turn in the road, being pushed on by the combined efforts of the men. The Bramhun's heart bounded when he saw the figure of the priest beside the litter, holding to it, and pressing up the ascent vigorously. "Will he escape?" he said mentally; "the Mother forbid it,—let her take him!" A few more steps, and the palankeen was at the knoll; it was set down, and the Khan's shoes being placed for him by a bearer, he put his feet into them and got out, speaking to the priest, who was panting with his exertion.

"Is he not here, Pantojee?" cried the Khan to the Bramhun, who saluted him respectfully.

"No, my lord, not yet. Ah! look," he continued, as he turned towards the pass, "there are two men on the path, and that one, the smallest, is he."

"The men coming down appeared to hesitate, and waved their hands, as if warning off some one.

"It is the bearers," said one of Sivaji's Secretaries. "The Rajah is timid, and fears the crowd he sees."

The Khan laughed. "Good," he said to the men. "Go away; sit down yonder in the shade. You will be called when I want you;" and as they got up and retired, the two men advanced slowly and cautiously down the pathway.

Afzool Khan went forward a few paces as Sivaji and Maloosray came up. "You are welcome, Rajah Sahib. Embrace me," he said to Sivaji. "Let there be no doubt between us;" and he stretched forth his arms in the usual manner.

Sivaji stooped to the embrace; and as the Khan's arms were laid upon his shoulders, and he was thus unprotected, struck the sharp deadly tiger's-claw dagger deeply into his bowels, seconding the blow with one from the other dagger which he had concealed in his left hand.

Afzool Khan reeled and staggered under the deadly wounds. "Dog of a Kafir!" he cried, pressing one hand to the wound, while he drew the sword he wore with the other, and endeavoured to attack the Rajah. Alas! what use now were those feeble blows against concealed armour? Faint and sick, the Khan reeled hither and thither, striking vainly against the Rajah, who, with the terrible sword now in his hand, and crying the national shout of "Hur, Hur, Mahadeo!" rained blow upon blow on his defenceless enemy. It was an unequal strife, soon finished. Falling heavily, Afzool Khan died almost as he reached the earth.

Meanwhile, Maloosray had attacked the priest with all his force and skill, but the Peer was a good swordsman, and for a short time held his ground. Neither spoke, except in muttered curses, as blows were struck; but Tannajee Maloosray had no equal in his weapon, and as he cried to the Rajah, who was advancing to his aid, to keep back—the priest, distracted by the assault of another enemy, received his death-blow, and sank to the ground.

"Jey Kalee!" shouted both. "Now blow loud and shrill Gunnoc, for thy life," continued the Rajah, "and thou shalt have a collar of gold."

'The man who had appeared to be a labourer, seized his horn, which had been concealed in the grass, and blew a long note, with a shrill quivering flourish at the close, which resounded through the air, and echoed among the mountains; and thrice repeated the signal.

'Then a great puff of smoke, followed by a report which thundered through the valley, burst from the bastion above. Those who were looking from the fort, and the Rajah himself who ran to the edge of the knoll, saw the wreaths of fire which burst from the thickets about the plain where the Mahomedan cavalry stood, and a sharp irregular crash of matchlock shots came up from below, and continued. Hundreds died at every volley, and there were writhing, struggling masses of horses and men on the plain—loose horses careering about; and some men still mounted, strove to pierce the barriers which had been made on every side, crowded on each other, and, falling fast, became inextricable. Soon, too, the Mawullees, under Nettajee Palkur, emerged sword in hand from their ambush, and attacked those who survived. Some escaped; but of the fifteen hundred men who had ridden there in their pride that morning, few lived to tell the tale.' (Vol. iii. pp. 153–62.)

We have selected this passage, not because it is the most interesting or graphic in the book, but because it appears to be more easily detached than any other within the limits we can assign to it. But we think the scene will not easily be forgotten by any one who has once read it in the impressive and picturesque language of this tale. No one, as far as we can remember, has written of the natives of India in this spirit. Persia and Turkey have in turn been faithfully delineated by the pens of a Morier and a Hope. But India, in which we have a far deeper interest than in any other part of Asia, is still but imperfectly known to England—perhaps, we might even add, to many of the English who have inhabited and governed it. To inspire his countrymen with a deeper interest in the past annals of the people of India is, we are informed by Captain Taylor, one of the objects he had in view in his work, and we think he has succeeded in it to a very remarkable degree.



ART. X.—1. *Report of the Incorporated Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.* 1863.

2. *Documents relative to the Erection and Endowment of additional Bishoprics in the Colonies, with an Historical Preface.* By the Rev. ERNEST HAWKINS. Fourth Edition. 1855

3. *Judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on the Appeal of the Rev. W. Long v. the Right Rev. Robert Gray, D.D., Bishop of Cape Town, from the Supreme Court of the Cape of Good Hope.* 1863.

WE are anxious on the present occasion to deal with a subject of serious interest to members of the Church of England in a practical manner, and so as to excite as little as possible the various controversial feelings which its discussion is calculated to arouse. The present condition of that Church in our colonies, and in particular of the colonial episcopate, has furnished the occasion of a great deal of honest triumph to that class of devout minds which is satisfied with statistical results, detailed in religious publications; and it has been, on the other hand, a good deal misunderstood by that hostile party, diminishing but still numerous, which looks on the spread of Episcopacy as if it portended a return to the old days of ecclesiastical tyranny. Possibly a little quiet examination of the facts, and of the principles which govern them, may tend at once to damp the too triumphant aspirations of friends, and to abate the strong traditional enmity of opponents.

It is, however, a subject which cannot be discussed at all, with any prospect of a satisfactory issue, between persons who differ in opinion on the essential topics of the nature and necessity of episcopal government. The Church of England holds many adherents—and we speak of them with the sincerest respect—to whom the government of bishops, priests, and deacons is matter of divine right. To such persons the expediency of constituting a bishopric in this or that locality must always be matter of secondary interest. The maxim of ‘no church without a bishop’ draws with it the necessary corollary, that the presumption is always in favour of the establishment of a see in every place of which the population is either so far separate from others, or so numerous, as to render ministration by a distant bishop in the slightest degree inconvenient. No evils, in the eyes of those who think thus, can be really so great as the absence or precariousness of episcopal control. We know that the excessive multiplication of colonial sees of later years

has in point of fact originated with this party, though supported by others of less decided views. And it is obvious that the employment with these of arguments and considerations derived from mere expediency is wholly out of place. To them, therefore, our observations are not addressed.

But with the vast majority of the laity of that Church, the question of Episcopacy is one of expediency only. They believe a church, governed without bishops, to be just as truly and essentially a church as one governed by them. They love Episcopacy, simply as most men love Monarchy; believing Dr. Candlish to have just as much divine right as the Archbishop of Canterbury, and President Lincoln as much as Queen Victoria, but greatly preferring the rule of the latter. Nor are they (for the most part) carried away even by the more modest argument, that Episcopacy, though not of absolute right, is nearest to the apostolical pattern. \* They know very well that Episcopacy, in this country and in most of the greater European countries whether of the Roman or Greek persuasion, is very far indeed from the apostolical pattern in everything but mere name. They know that many a Reformed community, which has no regular episcopal government, is in externals a good deal nearer the kind of model which existed in the early churches of apostolic origin, than is an English or a French diocese; which proposition, indeed, only adapts to modern times an opinion which St. Jerome had expressed in the fourth century. But they do not believe that the apostles, or their Master, intended either to impose a model of government on the future Church, or even to leave a model for imitation. They believe that mankind were left free to adapt spiritual as well as civil government to the requirements of altered times and circumstances. Their preference for Episcopacy is, therefore, simply rationalistic, or, if stricter truth must be spoken, founded partly on reasonable argument, partly on traditional reverence and a deep dislike to innovation in sacred things.

With thinkers of this class the whole question of the expediency of establishing and maintaining colonial bishoprics, and the relation to the State under which it is advisable to place them, becomes arguable on the same grounds on which ordinary political topics may be discussed. But until the ground is cleared by a full admission of this principle, there is little advantage in controversies in which the real 'stand-point' is, at least on one side, not the avowed one. Extreme opinions (on any side of church questions), are not generally popular with the mass of educated thinkers in this country. Those, therefore, who have not the slightest hesitation in acting on them,

are apt nevertheless to feel a certain shyness in professing and maintaining them. Consequently such men are always tempted to shift the ground of discussion, and to put forward arguments of expediency in favour of measures which they are in reality resolved on supporting as prescribed by Divine command. There is, therefore, something hollow and unreal in their reasoning. They persuade themselves, no doubt (as it is very easy for human nature to do), that the argument from expediency is, in conformity with the supernatural argument. But it is the latter of which they are really thinking, when they are putting forward the former. And the opponent, who fancies that he has accumulated irresistible proofs in favour of this or that view founded on mere policy, or what is called common sense, is disappointed to find that he has produced no effect at all—that the reply is always a mere repetition of the original assertion. The truth is, that a man thoroughly imbued with a theological principle could not be persuaded even by the mathematical refutation of any corollary which he thinks proper to draw from that principle.

To take an instance familiar to all of us. The 'Sunday' question is probably regarded as a very difficult one by all religious minds which approach it as one of expediency, not of Divine right. The advantages of a more genial and liberal mode of observance than that which Puritanism has left us are obvious. But, on the other hand, the danger of any laxity which should open the way to general desecration is quite as evident. On grounds of human wisdom, therefore, the opening for discussion is very great. To those who believe that the Puritan observance is of Divine command, there is of course no opening for discussion at all. But they do not like to face the enemy with a simple avowal of this broad principle, and meet the consequences, of derision or of hostility, to which they would be thus exposed. They are constantly, therefore, tempted to put forward arguments of policy or social interest which are not their real, or at least not their substantial reasons. These arguments (as is commonly the case with what is unreal) are exaggerated, loose, even puerile; constantly and easily refuted; but refuted in vain, because the Supernatural lies in the background.

To take another instance, and one which no less plainly illustrates our meaning. There may be some social or moral objections to the liberty of marriage with a deceased wife's sister; that is not a question which we are concerned with discussing. But one thing is perfectly certain—whatever those objections may be, they are not such as would in any country, or at any

time, have induced society to prohibit such marriages, had not religious considerations been involved. These unions cannot do anything like the amount of harm which is done by other classes of marriages, against which no one ever thought of legislating—marriages, for instance, between persons of very unequal ages. But, if this be so, then all the mass of arguments against such unions *ab inconvenienti*—all the efforts to turn it into a ‘women of England question’—are, in reality, shams. It does not at all follow that those who use them are conscious that they are shams. Their eyes are blinded by zeal for a favourite religious principle. They believe that the Church, as they understand it, has condemned these unions. Convinced of this, all other considerations with them are as nothing in the balance. But they know that the avowal of this simple rule of action is unpopular with the world. Consequently they are driven to use that almost inevitable artifice of which we have spoken—to put forward, as principal, arguments which are subsidiary at best, or rather illusory—the scriptural argument, which never persuaded any one except some zealous student in his closet—the ‘social’ argument, which assuredly never persuaded any one except such as were determined to be persuaded; instead of boldly relying on their esoteric conviction, that ‘the Church has spoken.’

If our illustrations be accepted, they will perhaps make more evident to the reader the difficulty which those who regard church government as a matter only of human authority have in dealing with the arguments and statements of those zealous men who, in the publications of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and elsewhere, have advocated the extension of the Colonial Episcopate to the extraordinary dimensions which it has of late attained. They propound, on the low ground of expediency, measures to which they have evidently themselves been led by the ‘high priori road’ which abandons the bye-ways of expediency altogether. When the late excellent Bishop of London (a name never to be mentioned without honour, for whatever may be thought of his opinions or his judgment, his heart was in all he did, and his munificence was almost as unlimited as his industry), in that letter to Archbishop Howley (April 24, 1840) which laid the foundation of that scheme of extension, informs us that the Church of England in the colonies was at that date ‘not enshrined in the sanctuary of ‘a rightly constituted church;’ and that ‘an episcopal church ‘without a bishop is a contradiction in terms,’ he (or those who inspired the language, for his own notions on such subjects were rather wavering) did in truth lay down dogmas, from which,

if you admit the premises, there is no manner of appeal. Why then did the Bishop proceed to argue the case on the special grounds of the utility of episcopal control over clergy, and similar common topics? Merely, we suppose, in that ordinary spirit of concession to the lower view which, as we have said, is so constantly adopted by those who are in reality actuated by the higher.

Adopting, however, as our basis of argument the lower view only, let us see what are the real purposes for which bishops are required in the distant dependencies of the British Crown. These are of two classes—functional (if we may use the term), and administrative.

There are (in the words of Bishop Blomfield) certain ‘ordinances which can be received only at the hands of the highest order of the ministry.’ We need not here specify the few ritual functions which by the law of our Church are purely episcopal. Suffice it to say, that there is only one of them in which the bishop performs, in sober reality, any other than a mere mechanical part—namely, ordination. Of the very high importance of that function, and the responsibility which it throws on a bishop, no question can be entertained. But its importance varies entirely according to the extent of the community administered and the multitude of candidates. A duty which is almost too serious to be intrusted to an individual in London or Winchester, is in truth quite inconsiderable in a colonial diocese with twenty or thirty clergy. Leaving therefore spiritual dogmas apart, what is wanted for the practical purposes of the churches of our scattered Empire is, not a bishop for every islet, but a modification of the law of the Church to enable these functional duties, in cases of necessity, to be executed by inferior officers. The fabric of the Church would not fall in ruin, if other than bishops were to confirm—presbyters did so in some old oriental churches, and even the cautious Hooker admits the precedent—or even to ordain, in extreme cases. We are quite aware of the practical difficulties which impede legislation for our Church; but we can only say, that to appoint a bishop for every nook over which the English flag floats, merely because none but bishops can ordain or confirm, does realise Lamb’s famous parable of burning the house to roast the pig more than any other existing device of human ingenuity with which we are acquainted. And yet such is the power of form, that this is the main reason on which the foundation of colonial bishoprics was urged by Archbishop Secker a century ago; and urged in a letter to that eminent friend of the Church, Horace Walpole—

'Confirmation is an office of our Church, derived from the primitive ages; and, when administered with due care, a very useful one. All our people in America see the appointment of it in their prayer-books, just before the Catechism; and if they are denied it unless they come over to England for it, they are, in fact, prohibited the exercise of one part of their religion'!\*

The real ground which justifies the creation of a new bishopric is a certain amount, not of formal, but of administrative work to be done: the government of a diocese, and superintendence of its clergy. With regard to these, it is quite unnecessary, in writing for churchmen, to dilate on the great value of a constituted episcopacy in regions with a large and increasing settled population of English descent, such as Australia and North America; or with numerous and scattered posts of English soldiers and officials, and a vast heathen multitude outside the Church, as in our great Indian dioceses. But our colonial episcopates comprehend every gradation between engrossing work and absolute idleness. There are dioceses (such as some of those alluded to) in which the Anglican population already exceeds that superintended by the Bishops of Hereford or Carlisle, of Llandaff or St. Asaph's, and is at the same time rapidly on the increase and scattered over vast tracts of country. There are dioceses like Nassau (the Bahamas), with 30,000 inhabitants of all persuasions, or St. Helena, with 6000, and without any possibility of expansion. They vary, in

---

\* The Archbishop, a man of sagacity and good sense, took, however, better ground in his argument with Dr. Mayhew on this subject (see Porteus' 'Life of Secker'). But it is curious to see the 'bated breath' with which the chief functionary of our Church disclaimed all encroachment on the rights of dissenting bodies in America—at a time when penal laws flourished in Ireland, and Test and Corporation Acts in England. 'All members of every Christian church are, according to the principles of liberty, entitled to every part of what they conceive to be the benefits of it, entire and complete, so far as consistent with the welfare of civil government. Yet the members of our Church in America do not there enjoy its benefits, having no Protestant bishop within 3,000 miles of them—a case which never had its parallel before in the Christian world. Therefore it is desired that two or three bishops be appointed for them, to reside where His Majesty may think most convenient; that they may have no concern in the least with any persons who do not profess themselves to be of the Church of England, but may ordain ministers for such as do, may confirm their children, and take such oversight of the episcopal clergy as the Bishop of London's commissaries in those parts have been empowered to take, and have taken, without offence.'

respect of the number of clergy, from Toronto with upwards of a hundred, Sydney and Melbourne with eighty-five a piece (we quote from the Clergy List), down to Bahamas aforesaid with twelve, and St. Helena which rejoices in eight. They vary widely in respect of their lay element. In the parts of British North America peopled from these islands, the Anglicans may amount to about a fourth of the population classified according to sects. In Australia, perhaps to two-fifths. In the old English West Indies a considerable proportion of the coloured people seems to be at least nominally attached to the Church. Elsewhere the Anglican community is small indeed. In some of our conquered colonies there are scarcely any churchmen, except a few officials and a few of the richer trading families. There are dioceses in which a bishop's life is one of toil and responsibility. There are others which had not the slightest occasion for a bishop at all, and in which the only sublunary reason for appointing one was, that their remote diocesans disliked the duty of visiting them.

Lastly, besides their services in governing the churches planted in the foreign dependencies of the Crown, bishops are now especially designated as the promoters and controllers of the missionary work to be accomplished by our Church among the heathen. The bishopric of Hong Kong, and still more that of Labuan, are in truth established for this purpose, rather than for the performance of episcopal duty among British subjects. But, besides these, we have within the few last years witnessed the phenomenon of the creation of so-called 'missionary bishoprics,' without any British seat at all. The interior of Africa, the Western Islands of the Pacific, the Sandwich Islands, are each committed, for the superintendence of the Church's work among the heathen, to the care of a 'missionary bishop.' We do not deny that we regard the innovation with very little expectation of good, and with some apprehension of evil. Every assumption of power however trifling or imaginary, every ostentation of dignity however frivolous, is in our view a hindrance to that great work of conversion which is only to be accomplished, if at all, by the arms of humility, simplicity, and self-abnegation. To speak merely of wordly opposition thus caused: it is said that the establishment of our 'missionary bishopric' in Africa has already excited to the highest degree the jealousy of the Portuguese clergy, nominally the spiritual lords of the region, and has in this way strengthened the hands of that confederacy of slave-traders who form the great obstacle in the way of our mission and of civilisation itself. And, besides this, the controlling power of

bishops over missionaries is of very doubtful advantage. There is something essentially free, and repugnant to external direction, in the true missionary spirit. Mr. Venn, in his recent life of Francis Xavier, cautions us with reason against —

‘A notion, too much countenanced at the present day, that an ecclesiastical head of a mission is needed to secure efficiency by uniformity of action, and to counteract the evils which may arise within a mission from the contrariety of individual opinions. Such absolute power may consist with the government of a settled Christian church, where the relation between ecclesiastical authority and the pastoral function has been defined by canons, and by experience. But no canons or regulations have been laid down for missions to the heathen. That work is so varied, and its emergencies so sudden, that the evangelist must be left to act mainly on his own responsibility and judgment. It preeminently requires independence of mind, fertility of resource, a quick observance of the footsteps of Divine Providence, a readiness to push forward in that direction, an abiding sense in the mind of the missionary of personal responsibility to extend the kingdom of Christ, and a lively conviction that the Lord is at his right hand. These qualifications are, like all the finer sentiments of Christianity, of delicate texture ; they are often united with a natural sensitiveness ; they are to be cherished and counselled rather than ruled ; they are easily checked and discouraged if “headed” by authority. Yet these are the qualities which have ever distinguished the missionaries who win the richest trophies, and advance the borders of the Redeemer’s kingdom.’

The lessons of history are at hand to testify to the sagacity of the venerable writer of these words. If Roman Catholics and Protestants could leave off disputing about the comparative success of their missionary endeavours, and look calmly at the results in both instances, they would be driven to confess how lamentably these fall short of what seemed the best-grounded expectations ; they would own, that, for whatever reason (and obvious reasons are not far to seek) Providence has not seen fit, in these later days, to crown their well-meant efforts with its blessing. Nevertheless, there are exceptions ; some great achievements have been accomplished by both. But these have been, in nearly every instance, the conquests of devoted men unfettered by ecclesiastical superintendence. It was by the efforts of Protestant missionaries of many denominations, long before Protestant missionary Bishops were dreamt of, that a Christian church was raised in Polynesia which, under all its discouragements, has more nearly brought back to us the image of the primitive ages than any other society reared in modern Christendom. And, on the other hand, our explorers, as they now penetrate into the secluded interior



of China, are constantly surprised by the discovery of large and well-conducted congregations of Catholic Christians, all but utterly unknown to the Western world, descended from those whom the successors of Xavier converted. But those conversions were not effected under the modern system of the Congregation de Propagandâ; they were the work of solitary enthusiasts, uncontrolled save by the general ties of their religious orders; the first 'Vicars Apostolic' with episcopal authority were only sent to China (we believe) in 1658, and the Roman Catholic Church in China has been stationary or declining for two centuries. There is no greater name in missionary annals than that of Francis Xavier himself; and Xavier not only dispensed with episcopal control for his own part, but was in constant mutiny against the Portuguese ecclesiastical authority, and was driven by what he deemed its sins of omission and commission into the strange measure of counselling the kings of that country to place the work of conversion exclusively in the hands of the civil governor. 'In order that there may be no mistake about this declaration, I should wish you to mention each of us who are in these parts by name, declaring that you do not lay upon us, either individually or collectively, the duty which conscience demands of you; but that, wherever there is an opportunity of spreading Christianity, it rests upon the Viceroy or Governor of the place, and upon him alone.'<sup>\*</sup>

To return to our more immediate subject, Nova Scotia in 1787, Quebec in 1793, were the first episcopal sees created in the colonial possessions of Great Britain. British India was placed under a bishop shortly after the renewal of the Company's charter in 1813. The West Indies (Jamaica and Barbados) in 1824. There are now forty, and the number is almost annually increasing. We cannot find space on the present occasion for tracing the various subdivisions of these dioceses, and creations of new ones, which have subsequently taken place, although the subject is an interesting one: it will be found summed up in a very convenient tabular form in Mr. Ernest Hawkins's publication, under the heading 'Progress of the

---

\* We quote from Mr. Venn's 'Missionary Life and Labours of Francis Xavier,' p. 160. A curious instance of the saint's independent ways, as regards the Bishop of Goa, occurs at p. 215. He sends a priest from Japan to Goa. 'Camerte was to take the priest to the Bishop, and to tell the Bishop that Emanuel was no longer a Jesuit, as Xavier had expelled him from the community: and that he now, therefore, belonged to the jurisdiction of the Bishop, who might deal with him as he pleased!'

'Episcopate in the Colonies.' We must add, in order to complete our sketch of the framework of that Episcopate, that the Crown has since been advised to confer metropolitan rights, involving control over suffragan bishops, on three sees—Sydney, New Zealand, and Cape Town. But whether these rights are more than shadows is a question which may possibly receive a solution whenever Bishop Gray descends into the arena against Bishop Colenso.

The advance of episcopacy was slow at first, and was probably retarded rather than accelerated by the notions which still prevailed respecting the maintenance of an endowed State Church in the colonies on the model of that existing at home. All the earlier colonial bishoprics were endowed out of the public revenues; either those of the colonies themselves, or of the mother country. They were consequently by no means popular institutions, either with the colonists, the mass of whom were generally dissenters, or with Parliamentary economists at home. It is due to Bishop Blomfield, and to those who acted along with him, to say that they were perhaps the first who distinctly perceived not only the causes and progress of this unpopularity, but the infinite elasticity which would be given to the Colonial Church through the removal of that State connexion in matters of finance by which they found it oppressed. They did not, of course, voluntarily renounce existing State endowments; but they prepared for their inevitable abandonment: they did not, for obvious reasons, leave the foundation and maintenance of bishoprics to the unaided 'voluntary principle,' but with great sagacity they provided a substitute, which should combine the grace and efficacy of the freewill offering with the permanency of public contributions. The two great Societies, for promoting Christian Knowledge and for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, voted in 1840 sums amounting in all to 15,000*l.*, and subsequently increased, to form a special fund, placed at the disposal of the English bishops, for the endowment of colonial bishoprics. This fund has since been supplemented by private munificence to a large extent. We find in Mr. Hawkins's publication (as long ago as 1855) the 'invested capital' of the fund alone estimated at 158,000*l.*, the dividend on it at 6,400*l.*; independent, of course, of annual subscriptions, and of donations either towards the general fund or towards particular bishoprics. The business of the fund is conducted by a 'special committee of bishops,' whose headquarters are at the office of the Propagation of the Gospel Society at Pall Mall. When a new bishopric is to be created, or a new bishop appointed to a former see, it is not for us to

trace the early channels through which the appointment actually permeates: but the final designation rests with the Colonial Minister, who guards sedulously this relic of the colonial prerogatives of the Crown, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, whose advice the Minister usually takes. It has been the ordinary practice of the Colonial Office to refuse consent to the creation of a new see, unless on assurance that a certain moderate endowment has been set apart for it, commonly out of the Fund, in conjunction with land or other provision contributed by colonial munificence. By these simple means, burdensome to none except to the inexhaustible strength of British charity, which feels no burden, the colonial episcopate has advanced at a rate which Bishop Blomfield would certainly not have dreamt of; and new sees are constantly created with a facility which threatens, unless the church community itself increases at a far greater rate than seems likely, to render episcopacy homœopathic. And at the same time the dependence of the bishops (and of the Colonial Church in general) on the public revenue has been gradually got rid of, without loss to holders or disturbance of arrangements. There are now, we think, no payments left to be made by Parliament towards the Church in the colonies; none from colonial revenues, except in the East and West Indies, and one or two other exceptional cases. When we remember that this great establishment has been created within these few years by the exclusive efforts of private munificence; that the expenditure on bishoprics forms a part only, and a small one, of what has been expended on Church-of-England purposes; and the whole of this again only a portion of the vast sums which have been contributed by all denominations in the same period towards colonial and missionary objects; we are surely warranted in holding that the ancient spirit of Christian munificence burns no less brightly in our modern and Protestant times than in those of old, whatever changes may have taken place in the mode of its action.

So far the picture is an agreeable one; and before we turn to the less satisfactory side of it, we may dwell for a moment on the solid advantages which have attended the establishment of bishops in English colonies, wherever there existed a real Church to preside over, a substantial body of laity, and a clergy sufficiently numerous to need the government of one in authority. The mere social good arising in a colonial community from the presence of a functionary whose office commands so much of old-fashioned respect and attention, whenever he is personally qualified to improve these advantages, is of no trifling order. Armed as he is with no coercive jurisdiction, he becomes

naturally a kind of standing authority, not the less respected from the absence of legal powers. To liken him to the prelates of apostolic ages, as is commonly done in the somewhat fulsome style of oratory which prevails at public meetings on ecclesiastical subjects, is absurd. But he may, if he will, be a very valuable and respected head of a Christian community, such as our very unapostolic times will admit of. His education in a country where few are highly educated, his position wholly independent of lucrative or ambitious pursuits, in a country where there is no idle class, and fortune-making is the only employment (as is commonly the case in colonies), add to the weight which the dignity of his office naturally gives him.

On the more immediately professional benefits (so to speak) arising from the established superintendence of a bishop, we need not dilate, as they are plain enough in practice as well as in theory. But one point of importance is worth mentioning. The Church in the colonies suffers from no evil more conspicuous than the paucity of ministers, and extreme difficulty of recruiting their ranks. Now, we believe it has been uniformly found that when an important province has been erected into a see, the result has been, at least at the outset, the securing at once a more numerous and a better supply of clergy.

But, unfortunately as we believe for the cause of the Church of England, if not for religion itself, the originators and promoters of the movement which we have recorded had other objects in view besides the mere supply of the actual wants of dioceses in which there was substantial work to do. Their ideal was an episcopate in which, as we have said, every community which could not be ranged with perfect convenience within a larger diocese should have a bishop of its own. Nor was this ideal adopted without a side view towards what, in truth, interested many of them far more than the progress of the Church in the colonies—namely, the politics of the Church at home. It has been a favourite purpose with many to alter fundamentally the character and distribution of our English episcopate—to have a much larger number of sees constituted, with bishops of inferior social and political pretensions to the small and distinguished hierarchy which now exists, but calculated to give the Church (in their view) an aspect more resembling that of the apostolical ages. The needs of the colonies (as has often been the case in other matters) were turned to some account in order to answer a domestic purpose. A numerous colonial hierarchy, of poor and zealous successors of the apostles, was to serve as a sort of precedent, hereafter as a model, for a new repartition of dioceses at home. Add to this notion, not very

prominent, but always prevailing; the other natural causes which led to the multiplication of bishops: the love of exercising patronage among a few busy managers at home; the love of title and power which led many a clergyman, who had scarcely any experience of parish life at all, to wish to commence his labours at once in the highest position; and we shall find reasons enough for the macadamisation of the ecclesiastical surface of the Queen's foreign dominions into little sees which has lately taken place, independently of those which we have described as arising from special views of episcopal authority.

The evils which arise from the insignificance, statistically speaking, of the greater part of the colonial episcopacy, are very seriously aggravated by the false position in which these bishops have been placed, through the mistaken attempt to preserve the analogy in temporal matters between them, with their extremely limited means and functions, and their brethren in this country. And here, we cannot but think, the founders of the colonial episcopate had much to answer for. They erred knowingly, with a full view of the difficulties into which they would surely plunge their colonial clients, because they had not the moral courage to adopt an alternative which might react unfavourably (as they feared) on the Establishment at home.

For the Church of England is, for good or evil, an establishment to this day. Its clergy enjoy by freehold tenure that proportion of the annual increase of the land which was set apart for purposes of religious worship ages before the oldest family in the realm had acquired a title to its estates. It has lost, it is true, one by one, those exclusive political rights which its members at one time enjoyed. But that loss is so recent, historically speaking, that the outward characteristics of supremacy still hang about it. Dissenters, unless of the more violent class, are all apt to recognise it as entitled at least to a kind of elder brother's precedence. And, which is perhaps the most important circumstance of all in its present position, its enjoyment of independent revenue makes it the natural teacher of the poor throughout the realm, and must inevitably (so long as it exists) give it great numerical preponderance. Its bishops retain the territorial titles of their dioceses, having inherited these titles by direct descent from the first preachers of Christianity in Britain; and have just right, on constitutional and historical grounds, to regard as interlopers any other hierarchy which may seek to establish itself on the same soil. This title, involving the semblance of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the whole local community; the fraction of power still retained by our bishops in the House of Lords; the further title of lordship, appropriate to that

rank ;—these are matters to which we are accustomed, which run contrary to the prejudices of but few, and (thanks in great measure to the temperance and good sense, as well as the higher qualities, which have distinguished in later times the majority of our ecclesiastical authorities,) have certainly less unpopularity to encounter now than they met with a few years ago.

It was forgotten, or rather it was ignored, that the position of the Church of England in the colonies was wholly destitute of these advantages. It had no hold on the affections of the mass, no historical life, no body of poor communicants, no dignity, no revenues ; the feeble attempt to create such having been foiled under a storm of unpopularity. Indeed, political change in these matters has been so rapid, that the 'clergy reserves' of Canada, the subject of so much discussion hardly a generation ago, seem almost as much out of date as King John's donation of England to the Pope. Men of English birth constituted the minority of the settlers in all our colonies, except the Australian : and among the English, Dissenters either predominated or formed a strong minority. The poorer classes, instead of clinging to the Church with a kind of traditional reverence as at home, feeling themselves left absolutely to choose, are apt on the whole to select some more exciting or imposing form of religion. Anglicanism is emphatically the religion of the well-to-do ; of the official class, the class which aims at social position, the class (let us add in justice), which is most highly educated, and least tolerant of the coarse and vague assumptions by which sects of less prescriptive authority seek to maintain themselves. But the all-embracing religion of the people it is, absolutely, nowhere ; in spite of the efforts made in recent times to extend its offices to the humbler classes of society.

It was the bounden duty of those who constituted the colonial episcopacy to have taken notice of this broad distinction, and to have framed their platform in the manner best calculated to support the weight which was actually imposed on it. Territorial titles in such a case were absurd, and should have been omitted, not only as superfluous but as really mischievous from the false ideas they create. The highest church authority in a colony or part of it should have been simply Bishop A or B, the recognised head of the Anglican community therein established—not the bishop of a diocese, that is, the ecclesiastical overseer of the community of Christians within that diocese ; which, emphatically, he is not. His title is an anomaly and an anachronism, and provocative (not unnaturally) of opposition and jealousy. Such pretensions are for Rome, not for us. Still less (it is scarcely necessary to add) should this

modest functionary have been decorated with the foolish title of lordship, or with outward trappings of rank and precedence associated with that title. So great was the prejudice at first excited by this idle concession to vanity or mistaken policy, that it was publicly stated by the late Mr. Ellice (as reported in the debates on the Colonial Church Act of 1854), that the legislature of Canada, on hearing of the appointment of the first lord bishop, took up the matter seriously, and resolved, by a majority of thirty-six to four, that 'the Church of England, as established by law in the 'mother' country, is not the religion of the majority of the 'people of Canada.' But the truth is that the dignity of the colonial episcopate was fixed, not with reference to the actual wants of the colonies, but partly to high church transcendental notions respecting the office, partly (and we believe far more) to State Church notions connected with the mother country. If the territorial designation and the lordly title ceased in the colonies, they would no longer be regarded by the multitude as inseparable accidents of the office: a class of inferior bishops, quasi-bishops, would be constituted in the Church; and who could tell how so dangerous an experiment might react on the Church at home? Therefore, the colonial bishops must be constituted, after the domestic pattern, sole governors of the Christian community within certain geographical limits; and in the documents by which their authority is conveyed, and the formal ecclesiastical language which is used respecting them, there must not be one word to convey the idea that any religious persuasion except their own exists within those limits at all. The colonial bishop must occupy in all titular and external matters exactly the same position as the English; although the bishop of the smallest English diocese has real work to do, and dignity to maintain, while if the bishop of Quebec, or Cape Town, or Colombo, were to leave his colony with the whole of his adherents, it would not make an appreciable difference in the next census.\*

\* Everyone is probably aware of the neat fiction by which the Church of Rome has avoided the apparent presumption of constituting new dioceses without substantial communities, and at the same time maintained the fanciful rule that every bishop must have a territorial designation. Dioceses in heretical or heathen lands were commonly governed by vicars apostolic, bearing the title of some ancient and no longer existing diocese—Bishops in *partibus infidelium*, as they are styled. An arrangement which seems to have been first adopted with reference to India and the East, and probably with the object of evading the extravagant claims of the kings of Portugal to ecclesiastical jurisdiction there. We know not whether it is a sign

But it must be added, that those who are impressed with a full sense of the consideration due to other Christian communities than our own; those who cannot but see with reluctance any assumption on the part of our Church of a position other than that which reason and her own principles assign her, that of an 'assembly' of Christians, strong as we believe in the purity of her faith and in her adherence to ancient ways, but an assembly only among other assemblies, a commonwealth among other commonwealths;—to those who thus think, there is something peculiarly untoward in the manner in which she, in her quality of State Church, arrogated to herself the right of creating territorial dioceses in lands not heathen, but conquered from powers of other Christian persuasions. It was a practice which set aside at once all that there is of liberty and brotherhood, and of the courtesies by which these are maintained between different communions, and substituted the hard formulas of out-of-date supremacy. What right had we to constitute a 'Bishop of Cape Town' with a territorial diocese extending over the colony? The Cape Colony was conquered from the Dutch. The Dutch settlers, in possession of the soil, belonged almost entirely to an established Protestant community, the 'Dutch Reformed Church,' which has its own traditions and its own rites, consecrated by long usage, and esteems itself, no doubt, purer and more apostolic than our own. Anglicans there were none in the colony, except a few officials and a few traders, and a sprinkling of English emigrants in the eastern division, which has since been formed into a separate diocese; so that the Bishop of Cape Town is very nearly (from no fault of his own) a sinecure functionary, or would be so, were it not for the duty which seems to have devolved on him of fighting the Church's battle against obstinate presbyters and heretical suffragans.

Now we wish very much to know, in what respect the act of our Government, in constituting a 'diocese of Cape Town' in a colonial community, differed from the act of the Roman See which excited among us such loud and indignant complaints only a few years ago, when it parcelled out Protestant England into territorial dioceses? Surely we shall not be answered, that, the Queen has civil rule at the Cape, the Pope none in England. Such an answer would but open afresh the

---

of increasing strength, or of increasing ostentation, that this machinery seems to be getting out of use, and territorial bishops succeeding vicars-general over great part of the Romanist missionary field.



door of that chamber of horrors, the old state church temple, now so happily closed with the assent even of those who cherished the longest their traditional Erastianism. The Church of Christ knows nothing of conquerors and conquered, governors or governed. Nor does the modern church polity of this British monarchy. Whatever the merits and demerits, the rights, claims, and position of any sect in its foreign dominions may be, they are absolutely and wholly irrespective of political circumstances; they involve not only no disabilities, but no inferiority. On such principles alone, in the opinion of all, can our vast empire be governed: on such principles alone is it worth governing, in the opinion of those whose notions of Christian liberty are fixed. Of course the Anglo-Catholic has in this instance the ready answer that the Reformed Dutch Church at the Cape and in Guiana is in reality no church at all, that it is only termed so by courtesy, and that a land in which it prevails is, for ecclesiastical purposes, in the same position as a heathen land. But this argument would fail even him in other cases. How, for instance, justify the establishment of a Bishopric of the Mauritius, a Roman Catholic colony under regular papal government?\*

In the early stage of the movement so little attention was paid to scruples of this description, that Bishop Blomfield regarded Valetta as the proper 'station of a bishop,' and it was intended to appoint a Bishop of Malta, where episcopal succession is believed to have existed ever since Saint Paul. This error was avoided, and the title 'Bishop of Gibraltar' given to the dignitary appointed to exercise the episcopal office among our mixed population of traders and idlers scattered along the Mediterranean. But the change was a very incomplete evasion of the difficulty, as Gibraltar, though it happens not to be the seat of a Spanish bishop, is under regular hierarchical government, and a Protestant bishop of Gibraltar is just as much a stone of offence to fastidious Romanists as a Romanist bishop of Southwark to orthodox Anglicans.†

\* The 'Bishopric of Quebec' might seem a stronger case of abuse still. This, however, is not quite the fact. Although the title was unfortunate, the see was constituted for the whole of Canada, which then consisted of a stationary French community in the east, and an increasing British community in the west. Since then the parts of Canada in which there is a substantial Anglican population have been constituted into other dioceses, and the Bishop of Quebec—like him of Cape Town—left, in truth, a sinecurist.

† It was reported (we do not know how truly) that the late Bishop, in the first elation of his appointment, appeared in the streets

It may, however, be argued, that these objections to the system of our colonial episcopate are superficial only; that the substance is achieved if our churches are placed under regular government; that the small dimensions of some of the sees, the over-pretension of some of the titles, are trifling blots which do not really affect the efficacy of the institution. We fear, however, that this is not the case. These mistakes, if trifling, are of that class of trifles which lead to serious evils. The share which feeling, sentiment, 'prestige,' have in ecclesiastical matters is too great to allow of this violation without entailing consequences beyond what may seem at first sight to be warranted. The Anglican bishop, placed in a community hostile or indifferent to him with the outward pretension of governing it, is in a false position from the beginning. If he has, as is commonly the case, very high notions of episcopal authority, so much the worse. He fills two distinct characters. In his own imagination, in the language of his letters patent, in the rank which is allotted him when he visits the old country, in the formal documents of his great constituents, the Propaganda of Pall Mall, he is the successor of the apostles, the functionary having power to bind and to loose over a region equal in extent to an European kingdom. In the general society of his own diocese, he is simply the head officer of a single communion, often by no means the most numerous; obliged either to meet with his brethren, the governing authorities of other persuasions, on terms of mere equality, or to keep aloof from them in very unprofitable isolation. He may advance to his own clergy, or in correspondence with the societies at home, the most orthodox claims of spiritual supremacy; but if he is to take any joint action with his mates, the Presbyterian moderator, and the Wesleyan superintendent, he can but address them as one of themselves—

‘Je suis oiseau, voici mes ailes;  
Je suis souris, vivent les rats!’

We have heard of an excellent colonial bishop, who used to perambulate his diocese with a staff which was an artistic compromise between a crozier and a walking-stick. Even such a compromise must the life of the colonial bishop himself to a great degree impersonate.

This is the case even where dioceses are of sufficient im-

of Rome with some kind of episcopal insignia. Zealous people were affronted, and brought the rumour under the notice of the Pope (Gregory XVI.). ‘Better let him alone,’ said the shrewd old man. ‘But I never knew before, that Rome was in the diocese of Malta.’

portance to give their occupants some title to the character of working bishops; much more so, where, either from the infinitesimal smallness of the diocese itself, or the very small number of Anglicans, there is really no work to perform. We entertain great pity for the clergyman, of ardent character possibly and high anticipations, who has been seduced into the life-long mistake of assuming a post of this description. What is he to do? Clergy he has scarcely any to govern, and no constitutional power (as we shall presently see) to govern these. He has probably had visions floating before him of missionary exertion; but (omitting the Indian dioceses), there are only eight or nine colonial in which there is any missionary work to perform, and in some of these very trifling. His duties resolve themselves into a narrow and dreary round of functions, in a small, money-getting, little-educated, indifferent society. He may make what apparent work he can out of confirmation tours and other formal operations; but this is not substantial business, nor does it occupy the mind as such. It has been often suggested that he should unite the functions of parish priest with those of bishop; and to a certain extent we believe this is done; but there are obvious objections to the union. The bishop, whose great function is to superintend others, cannot, without difficulty, place himself on the level of the superintended. He has to correct irregularities, to repair omissions, as bishop, to the commission or suspicion of which as priest he is himself daily exposed. He will follow his own views respecting the conduct of divine service, and the government of a parish; but he cannot legally impose these on others: he ought not to do so, if he could: he has therefore the annoyance of seeing, and submitting to see, his authority habitually disregarded by those over whom he presides, through neglect or disinclination to follow the model which he sets up.

And it is in this forced inactivity that we find the main secret of that peculiarity which has of late years caused the greatest amount of popular scandal with respect to colonial bishops—their constant absence from their dioceses, and repeated visits to England. There is something very locomotive and restless in the habits of the episcopacy over great part of the world in these latter days. The same phenomenon is noticed in ecclesiastical history, just at the period when the early ages of Christian persecution ceased, and a sort of joyous superabundance of activity took possession of the emancipated Church. The bishops of the fourth and fifth centuries seem to have been almost always on their travels from synod to synod, or to and from the presence of some noted theological

chief, whose voice was influential as the pagan oracles. And so in our times, in the Church of Rome, any opportunity, small or great—the canonisation of some Japanese martyrs, the meeting of a Catholic Council at Malines—seems sufficient to draw together flocks of migratory bishops, who have little or nothing to do with the special occasion, from all quarters of the world. But we have never heard that, either in ancient or modern times, their dioceses were much the better for this licensed vagrancy, though no doubt the source of much enjoyment to themselves. Our colonial bishops—we speak of course with the proper exceptions—have a much better excuse for yielding to this habit of pilgrimage. They abandon no duty, for they have really none to perform which may not be quite as well executed by the commissaries whom they leave behind them. The temptation to ‘come home’ is so very strong. It is like emerging from darkness to day, from prison to freedom. They leave behind them the performance of insignificant and thankless functions, and the constant mortifications which beset position without power. Here, they are brought in contact with all that is enlivening and inspiring in the circumstances of their profession: they meet with the respect which episcopal dignity in any shape commands, from a large and influential portion of our community: they participate in the little religious ovations which are the lot of interesting strangers both in London and in the provinces. And, as self-indulgence has always its excuses, they have the satisfaction of alleging (not without the show at least of reason), that they are serving the cause of their dioceses more effectually here, by calling the attention of the mother country to their spiritual wants, recruiting clergy, and collecting money, than they would be if locally engaged in their unexciting vocation. And so the scandal seems annually to increase—a scandal doubtless, but perhaps an apparent rather than a real evil. We believe, indeed, that there is no authority whatever, either in the Colonial Governments or in the Government of the mother country, to compel these homesick prelates to reside in their dioceses; and they appear to be fully aware of the liberty they enjoy. Nothing could more effectually demonstrate the fact that they are subject to no authority on the one hand and that they exercise no authority (but by consent) on the other. They have no more coercive powers of any kind than a Roman Catholic bishop in England or an Anglican bishop in Scotland; and we very much question whether there be any coercive authority over them.

This extremely indeterminate character of the authority of colonial bishops over the subordinate clergy is a point of so

much importance, particularly since the recent decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of 'Long *versus* the Bishop of Cape Town,' that we consider it necessary to devote some space to its investigation. •

In this country, the various dissenting communities have, it is scarcely necessary to say, no legal existence as such. They are simply voluntary associations, on which the law has no direct hold. They are self-governed, each according to its own usages, on a system strictly voluntary. If a minister (or other member of one of these associations) disobey the laws of the society, there is no legal mode of visiting the offence upon him. The only step which could be taken is to expel him from the society, in the same manner as in the case of an ordinary club. But the possession of property by the different religious communities has gradually brought them in contact with the law of the country, and taken them indirectly out of this category, namely, of simply voluntary associations. Property in chapels, dwelling-houses, charitable foundations, and the like, is held, under restrictions on which we need not dwell, by trustees: subject to the condition, that those who enjoy the use of such property conduct themselves according to the usages, preach the doctrine and maintain the discipline, of this or that religious body. And the high authority which controls this property, and settles disputes as to its enjoyment, is the Court of Chancery. And that Court must therefore, in the last resort, pronounce on questions of religious doctrine as well as discipline, and has occasionally done so. But, as a general rule, it will respect the decisions of the constituted authorities of the body itself on such questions. To use the language employed in a leading case on this subject (that of Dr. Warren), 'where an association of men have agreed upon the terms of their union, and have constituted a tribunal to determine whether those laws have been violated or not, then, if a tribunal so constituted has decided, in the due exercise of the authority intrusted to it, that an offence has been committed, a Court of Equity would not interfere.'

These legal doctrines are in truth the Magna Charta of non-conformity; and, on the whole, the various dissenting communities of this country may be considered to be administered under that union of self-government with necessary legal protection which is most conducive to their well-being and free action. Very different is the lot of the Church of England. The creature of the State (in a political sense), she is at once protected in her discipline, and controlled in all her movements, by a system of strict law, based on Act of Parliament, canon, or precedent. If a clerk misconducts himself in an

ecclesiastical sense, the law is open, and can be put in force by the bishop who governs him, and through the ecclesiastical courts. If that law is defective—if questions arise as to its application which are practically beyond the power of the Courts to determine—the only real resource is to Parliament. For the authorities of the Church of England cannot even meet to discuss changes without the license of the Crown; and what power they would have to effect changes, even with that license, is one of the many awful problems which remain for the present in *gremio legis*, and of which great lawyers look grim when they speak. Convocation, in theory, may be a body of vast power; but no one with history open before him can seriously contend that the two Synods so called have ever constituted in practice the governing body of the reformed Church of England.

It will be seen at once on what very different ground the Church of England and the various dissenting bodies met, when they were transplanted to the colonies. The latter experienced from the beginning no difficulty at all in continuing in the Crown's foreign dominions the system of government under which they had prospered at home. All that they needed was to have such property as they might possess or acquire brought within the fair jurisdiction of the colonial courts of law, and to have their separate codes of usage, sanctioned by habitual acquiescence, recognised by these courts as the rule for administering their property. And this they easily obtained. In some colonies (as in Australia, while under Crown government), well-conceived and impartial Acts were passed, to facilitate the management of property by the several communities; and remain at this time, for their limited purpose, the organic law of the Churches.

The Church of England, on the other hand, when transplanted to the colonies, was violently torn away from that State support on which it had hitherto leant. It had neither the habit nor the very principles of self-government; for it had none such at home. It could not even avail itself, in such a way as to avoid litigation, of those laws which secured to religious communities their property; for it had no constituted authorities to which those laws might apply. It had no legislature; for Parliament is the legislature of the Church of England, and Parliament will not legislate for the colonies. It had no executive government; for it is governed at home by ecclesiastical law, and that law, as we shall presently see, is not supposed to exist in the colonies. For a long time it had, as we have seen, no bishops; and the episcopal power is, of course, in our Church the foundation of discipline. And this

was one of the substantial reasons for the zeal with which the project of Colonial Episcopacy was at first urged. But when the bishops were appointed, they found, to their utter discomfiture, that it was questionable whether any shred of that legal authority which attaches itself to bishops in England attaches itself to their brethren in the colonies, and this doubt is now considerably strengthened by the recent decision of the Privy Council.

The case appears to stand thus. But we must premise that we are laying down the law chiefly on the general impression conveyed through the dicta of judges and opinions of eminent lawyers. Acts of Parliament there are none to refer to. Decisions directly bearing on the subject there are scarcely any, until the important recent judgment to which we have adverted. It is, then, a principle established in theory—though of the vaguest possible application—that English colonists carry with them to a new country which they may occupy so much of the law of England as is applicable to their new position, and no more. It is another principle, that the power of adding to or modifying that law—the power of legislation, in short—belongs to the colonists only; they carry with them the English Constitution. The Crown cannot legislate for them. But again: in colonies which are not settled by Englishmen, but have been conquered by the Crown from foreign Powers, the Crown retains the power of legislation. Should, however, the Crown think fit to constitute an elective legislature in any such colony, from that moment the Crown's absolute power of legislation has departed, and is superseded by the new authority, usually of Assembly, Council, and Crown.

Such, we say, is the theory of colonial government—a theory so well founded in English instincts that it may be considered as established, although in point of fact it rests on the slightest possible authority—having neither statute nor distinct common law as its basis, and having been merely elaborated out of the brains of two men of creative genius in their limited sphere—Chief Justice Coke and Lord Mansfield. This being so, the question of course naturally arose in men's minds: Is ecclesiastical law part of that law which the settler carries with him? Can a bishop erect a court, try and punish offending clerks, and (by way of corollary) compel the attendance of witnesses and administer legal oaths, as part of the fundamental law of the colony? Or, if he cannot, then can the Crown, either by letters patent constituting a court with ecclesiastical jurisdiction, or by letters patent giving a bishop power to correct his clerks, introduce that law or the appropriate portion of it?

The answer to the first question has never been authentically given. The case has never been directly submitted to any tribunal. We may, for our parts, fancy that a very reasonable argument might be addressed to such a tribunal on the affirmative side of the argument. But any one who is aware of the relative positions of the champions of British and canon law ever since the Constitutions of Clarendon,

‘*Litora litoribus contraria, fluctibus undas,*’

might well fear the result of an appeal to the authorities of the former on such an issue. To the second question the answer could not be doubtful. To introduce ecclesiastical law, where it does not exist, is an act of legislation. Therefore the Crown cannot, either by letters patent or otherwise, either expressly or by implication, give a bishop the slightest power, in any colony having an independent legislature, to control his clergy. If such power exists at all, it is only in colonies still governed absolutely by the Crown, or where the Acts of Parliament constituting the government have left such power in the Crown.\*

The bishop, therefore, on his appointment, found himself destitute of legal or constitutional powers. His *real* power, indeed, might be no trifle. According to the law of some colonies, he had the right (with the consent of the Governor) to revoke an officiating clergyman's license, to remove clergy from their posts, or to transfer them from one to another. And, frequently, control was expressly given him in deeds creating charitable endowments for the benefit of the Church. But with all this authority, he had no legitimate method of exercising it; no courts, no recognised counsellors. As the Bishop of Oxford expressed it on one occasion, ‘The system forces the bishops, in spite of themselves, to act in cases of discipline as absolute autocrats, without the form of law.’ The mere possession of such power, not to say its exercise, is distasteful enough to an English gentleman and clergyman, accustomed himself to be governed by law; and we need not remark, in addition, how lavishly public opinion and its organ, the press, would be apt to pour

---

\* It is, perhaps, necessary to say that these observations on the absence of regular Church government in the colonies apply but partially—1. To the East Indian possessions of the Crown, which are left by Parliament under Crown legislation, technically speaking, and where episcopal letters patent have due force; 2. To the old West Indian colonies, where the Church of England has been for a long time established on a legal basis, and where we at least have not heard of any difficulty arising from imperfect legal control over the clergy.



forth its wrath on any functionary who should, in an indiscreet moment, have recourse to them in a questionable case.

The position was, indeed (or rather is), a most embarrassing one; for it must be added that the absence of regular government is almost as injurious to the Colonial Church, in respect of the management of its means and distribution of its income, as in respect to internal discipline. The ablest among her leaders saw that the only practical way of rescuing her from this state of impotence was by establishing some sort of municipal organisation, under which she might govern herself (for minor and ordinary purposes) in the same manner as branches of the several Protestant dissenting communities, planted in the colonies, govern themselves. And the model of the Episcopalian Church in the United States naturally presented itself to their minds. Movements, therefore, began within the last ten years, in certain colonial dioceses, towards the establishment of mixed synods of clergy and laity, such as subsist in America. And (unfortunately for the colonies) these movements were seconded by a good many influential and zealous friends of the Church in England, under leaders who were, in truth, far more anxious to accomplish their favourite object of synodical action at home, and to break asunder what they esteem the fetters of the State connexion, than merely to supply the modest and practical wants of the Anglican body in the colonies. This over-cleverness, which seeks to attain an ulterior purpose through a primary one, and seems never to be conscious that the design is penetrable by all the world, has impeded or frustrated many a meritorious enterprise in ecclesiastical as well as other matters; and so it proved in this instance.

It appeared, at first sight, as if the same voluntary impulse which created in 1789 the constitution of the Episcopal Church of the United States, with its Convention, and synods of mixed clergy and laity, might have effected the same object in the colonies, when the Church, unaided by the State, was placed on the same footing. But it was soon found that, in a legal view, the two cases were essentially different.

The American Episcopal Church was in truth never, even in colonial times, a branch of the State Church of England. Bishop Gibson's attempt to make it so by order in Council was an admitted failure. Even in Virginia, which boasted in old days of a kind of Anglican establishment of its own, the slight authority exercised by the commissary of the Bishop of London was (as Archbishop Secker himself observes) submitted to only by consent. In point of fact, the Church governed itself, in an

anomalous kind of way. As the Bishop of Oxford shows in his very curious volume on the history of the Episcopal Church in America, 'the proper check on clerical unfitness' (episcopal government) 'being thus wanting, the people began to substitute another.' Vestries arrogated to themselves the deficient disciplinary authority. When, therefore, the Revolution came, something like self-government was already established, and the 'General Convention' was but an expansion of the old rough system, adapted to the republican character of American institutions. But, in the next place, as regards the enforcement of its discipline and management of its property, the Church in the United States by no means rests on voluntary obedience. The courts of law to which she has to appeal for protection are guided by Acts, passed by the Legislature of New York, and, as we believe, of most of the states, 'providing generally,' in Chancellor Kent's language, 'for the incorporation of religious societies, in an easy and popular manner, and for the purpose of managing with more facility and advantage the temporalities belonging to the church or congregation.'

Neglecting the real warning conveyed by these precedents, the colonial church reformers endeavoured at first to constitute governing bodies by mere voluntary agreement, without the aid of law. Why, it may be asked and has often been asked, should they not? In the first place, because it is an open question, and a doubtful one, how far the courts of law in a colony would recognise as binding the decisions of any such body, a voluntary and in a sense usurping authority, not known to the mother church, and not resting, like the governments of dissenting communities, on recognised usage. But before arriving at this difficulty, a preliminary one had to be surmounted. Could the members of the Church meet at all, to constitute any new form of government by consent, without violating the law in the attempt?

Nothing could be more vehement—nothing, certainly, more startling—to those simple-minded people who were engaged *bonâ fide* in the endeavour to establish some kind of municipal administration in the colonial churches, than the sudden and awful denunciations with which the proposal to create synods, with purely voluntary or 'consensual' authority, was met by the leading lawyers and politicians of England. It was then all at once discovered, that though, as we have seen, spiritual law has not been transplanted to the Colonies—though their communities have not among them a single shred of ecclesiastical authority, nor can the Crown confer it—yet all the

fences and safeguards with which common and statute law have circumscribed the action of the Church in this country subsist, by some strange and galvanised vitality, in these distant regions. An Englishman, settling beyond the Pacific, shakes off altogether all spiritual government. Nevertheless, he carries with him (such at least were the notions loudly expressed) the Acts of Supremacy, Submission, Uniformity—the law of *Præmunire*—the Articles, the Prayer Book, and the Rubric. All these are ‘parts of the law of England suited to his condition’ which follow him into unsettled regions as inseparably as the right of self-taxation or trial by jury. He cannot meet with his neighbour to discuss the rules under which their new log church is to be served and managed, without the risk of some strange and formidable contravention of law. The Crown may, possibly, though that is doubtful, authorise his clergy to meet and talk over their necessities, without absolute disobedience; but it cannot give them the slightest power to remedy any one of those necessities, and if they call in laymen to assist their deliberations, this is little short of an act of rebellion.

Such irrational notions as these, so utterly unfounded on any intelligible principle, could not possibly have found currency in any nation but our own. The practical absurdity, to which they unavoidably led, would be treated, in communities less precedent-ridden, as amounting to refutation. But no amount of consequent absurdity is received as the refutation of a doctrine by a thorough English lawyer. It is sufficient for him that this or that principle has been laid down by competent authority, or may be collected by ingenious deductions from what has been laid down. Such a principle is thenceforward established, either as a certainty or a formidable probability, although it be demonstrable in the plainest way that those who laid it down, or laid down the data on which it is founded, had not, nor could have, the slightest conception of that new state of things to which it is now sought to adapt it. Or, if no principle be established, sufficient suspicion of illegality is at all events engendered to render all movement in a given direction impossible. The phantoms raised by legal conjuring are, unfortunately, no shadows; they rather resemble those grisly vampires of Northern legend, which used to get out of their graves and do battle with living men. No effort at voluntary organisation could be safely made by a colonial church, when any discontented person might put the movers to the expense of defending at law their right even to meet together for the purpose. The only way which appeared open to the friends of the proposed reform was to have recourse to Parliament for an

enabling Act. We need not recapitulate the enormous amount of previous objection which they had to get over, arising merely from the honest prejudices entertained by legal minds against an innovation which 'might lead no one knew where.' Mr. Gladstone, however, urged on no doubt by his ecclesiastical friends, so far prevailed as to introduce a bill for the purpose in 1852; but it was conceived on rather too ambitious a scale, and perhaps deservedly failed to command support. In 1854 the attempt was renewed by the present Lord Chancellor, who had the advantage of having thoroughly weighed the subject, of fully comprehending the real nature and extent of its legal difficulties, and of being biassed by no theological passion; and the bill which he framed was of the simplest enabling character, empowering the colonial clergy and laity to meet for the purpose of framing regulations for internal government without incurring legal danger, but carefully guarding the rights of other sects, of the colonial legislatures, and of the Crown, and the inviolability of the Prayer Book and Articles. The bill had scarcely progressed beyond a second reading in the Commons when it was assailed by one of those typhoons of Parliamentary violence in which the wind seems to blow from all quarters at once, in which reason and common sense cannot make themselves heard, and in which the weatherwise can only shake their heads, and observe that this kind of opposition is usually directed not against what is before the House, but against some concealed cause of unpopularity which lies in the background. Every section of the House—except the few High Churchmen—had its fling at the measure. Dissenters saw in it an attempt to create a State Church. 'Erastians' saw in it an attempt to deprive the Church of the fostering care of the State. Irish Churchmen could not see why the Colonies should want what Ireland can do without. Roman Catholics could not refrain from a decent exultation over the anarchy into which the rival communion seemed to have fallen. Non-lawyers avowed that they could not understand the bill—a measure on a subject of some intricacy, at which they had looked for five minutes—and they were therefore satisfied that the Solicitor-general did not understand it himself. Lawyers could not help enjoying the perplexity of a distinguished brother, baited by an angry pack of laymen who preferred their law to his. Some more refined objectors (not quite without reason, as we have already said) thought that 'Convocation was the real object of the measure, and that we should be met some years hence by a demand to place the Church at home upon the same footing as the Church of England in the Colonies.' In short, the

measure was withdrawn, having encountered such a tumult of disapproval as to show but too plainly, not that the purpose itself was really objected to, but that the general subject was one on which no prudent Minister could risk a Parliamentary engagement.

Defeated in this attempt, the friends of the movement were driven to another resource. It was resolved to try what might be done through the colonial legislatures. The recognised authority and importance of these bodies had been long on the increase. Lawyers were more and more disposed to regard with respect their powers of legislation, and to relax those very impracticable doctrines of former days which placed it out of their power to enact anything contrary to Acts of Parliament, or to the 'law of England' generally. It was, therefore, at last conceded by English legal opinion,—though reluctantly, and as if 'frustrate of its will,'—that the Act of a colonial legislature, with the assent of the Crown, might constitute on a firm basis a synod of mixed clergy and laity, with powers to regulate the affairs of the Church of England in a diocese, in the way both of discipline and the management of property, even to the extent of controlling the appointment and removal of the highest functionaries. This movement was commenced at the same time at the two ends of the world—in Victoria, where a law for the purpose was passed by the provincial legislature at the instance of the popular and able bishop of the diocese; in Canada, where the field was larger and the difficulties greater, and overcome only by good management on the part of the promoters of the bill, and by the liberality and good sense of the Canadian legislature—a little contrasted, we are sorry to say, with the temper exhibited by the British. The Canadian Act received the Crown's assent some years ago, after a lengthened argument before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which affirmed its validity. A similar measure has since been passed by the legislature of Tasmania. All these seem to be framed as nearly as may be on the model of that which was hissed off the boards at Westminster.

In South Australia, the bishop, with the clergy and laity of his persuasion, adopted a different course. Instead of applying to the legislature of the colony for an enactment in order to get rid of their supposed legal difficulties, they endeavoured to effect the same purpose by a 'consensual compact.' That is to say, certain 'fundamental provisions and regulations' were incorporated in an instrument adopted and signed by the bishop, the priests, and 'lay communicating members representing the

'respective churches mentioned opposite their signatures and 'seals.' And by a synod, constituted under these regulations, the Church of England in that colony has been administered since 1855. It is of course obvious how much of real difficulty and of apparent anomaly would be saved by such a scheme, in which a plan of ecclesiastical government, essentially voluntary in its character, is constituted by voluntary act and not by law. But the misfortune is, that any arrangement which has no more substantial foundation than this can really endure only while the consent on which it is founded endures. A troublesome minority—a single recalcitrant—may at any time endanger the peace and unity of a body resting on no legal warrant. Such appears to have been the conviction of the churchmen of South Australia; for they have recently applied to the legislature of the province to ratify their 'consensual compact' by a law. But that legislature, the child of Molesworth and of Wakefield, the very purest embodiment of philosophical radicalism, took the alarm at once. The colony was founded on 'Anti-State-Church' principles. To recognise the existence of any Church at all,—even in the recital of an Act—might not this be tampering with the evil thing? The result seems to be, that the consideration of the subject is adjourned, after a curious, but by no means ill-tempered, discussion between the chairman of the committee on the bill, and the bishop as a witness before it; in which, however, we must confess that the bishop does not exactly make clear to our minds the precise purpose for which he wants the measure, nor the chairman the exact reasons of his opposition.

In these various ways, however, synods have been created for purposes of government in some of our more important colonial possessions. Although the subject of their proceedings and success is one of great interest, we do not propose to enter on it now. Nor, indeed, have they as yet been long enough in active existence to allow of any fair judgment being passed on their performances. There may be those among us who have pretty strong opinions against the expediency of synodical government in any shape; or, at all events, except for matters of exceptional gravity. It may be doubted whether the more civilised communities of the world are not approaching an age in which speech must be subordinate to the press; in which the advantages of public debate in popular bodies, even for purposes of legislation, are more questionable than heretofore, *à multo fortiori* for purposes of administration. It may be thought, especially in ecclesiastical affairs, that such assemblies furnish rather a play-ground for the noisier and more demonstrative

spirits, while the real business is done by more influential men elsewhere. And it is certainly a disagreeable reflection, that the real energy and spirit of such bodies seems rarely to be called out, except when the business before them is of a judicial nature—to pronounce on the conduct of a man, or the contents of a book—functions for which, from their partisanship, they are peculiarly ill-adapted. Nor are we, for our own part, reassured on these heads by the history of the synodical contests which have occurred from time to time in the Episcopal Churches of America and of Scotland. But be these things as they may, synodical government, by bodies composed both of clergy and laity, is obviously the only alternative in our colonial churches for episcopal autocracy or mere anarchy. We have to make the best of it, and in this, as in other matters, we have to place our confidence in that sound Anglo-Saxon spirit of the majority, the spirit of organisation, of mutual compromise and of tolerance, which in other departments of administration carries us continually in safety through greater difficulties than these.

Recently, however, the questions of law to which we have alluded in this article, respecting the legal status of the Church of England in the Colonies, have been brought more prominently than ever before the public eye, by the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the remarkable case of '*Long versus the Bishop of Cape Town*.' The point actually and necessarily decided in that case is perhaps, as we shall see, one of comparatively small importance. But if the views regarding the general law which are expressed in the course of that judgment be finally upheld—and they have all the authority which the highest names in our existing judicature can give them—then it will be clearly seen that the impediments under which our Church labours in the Colonies are of no fanciful or unsubstantial nature, and that common justice cries aloud for their removal.

The Bishop of Cape Town, like so many of his brethren, was anxious to establish 'synodical government' on the American pattern in his diocese. We have said that this diocese was constituted (very erroneously in our opinion) in a community almost wholly belonging to the Dutch Reformed Church, and in which the Anglican laity are very few, and form (if such a description might be used without conveying offence) almost a caste apart in the population. Not quite unnaturally, the Church of England is the object of little love in the colony, and of some suspicion. It has been found impracticable (if we are rightly informed) to induce the popular legislature to frame any law on the Canadian pattern to authorise her self-govern-

ment. Under these circumstances, the bishop resolved to attempt to constitute synods by voluntary organisation. He relied for this purpose on the simple exercise of his episcopal authority. He summoned his clergy to attend certain meetings. And he directed them to give notice in their churches of these intended meetings. Now the Bishop of Cape Town is no inexperienced or over zealous beginner in the field of ecclesiastical politics. He is one of the oldest colonial bishops in date of appointment, a man of ability, and accustomed to consider the legal questions which his office involves. He could not but be aware of the kind of opposition which such a movement on his part was calculated to provoke: we are therefore doing him no injustice in conjecturing that he did so voluntarily, determined to risk the chance of the collision in his own person, and thus attaining, at all events, the end of demonstrating the state of legal impotence under which he and his fellows labour. So, of course, it turned out. The Rev. Mr. Long, styled 'incumbent of the parish of Mowbray,' refused to obey either order. His reasons for the refusal we need not recapitulate here: suffice it that they were grounded on objections both to the legality and religious expediency of the bishop's proceedings. The bishop, after due remonstrance, summoned Mr. Long before himself (aided by assessors named by himself), to show cause why he should not be suspended for disobedience. Mr. Long appeared, but under protest. He was suspended. He treated the sentence as a nullity, and continued to officiate. On this a further sentence of deprivation was pronounced by the bishop against him. Mr. Long applied for protection to the Supreme Court of the colony, presided over by two British lawyers and one colonial jurist. The proceeding took the form of a suit, 'according to the Roman-Dutch law,' with the details of which we need not trouble our readers. The bishop's counsel rested his right to convene synods, and to require the attendance of his clergy at such synods, on his general authority as a bishop of the Universal Church; on his special powers as a bishop of the Church of England, conveyed to him by his letters patent: and, lastly, on the supposed consent of Mr. Long to be governed by his bishop according to the usage of the Church of England. The Court (by a majority of two judges to one), decided in favour of the bishop (on the 15th February, 1862). They gave, indeed, but slight attention to the supposed claim from the abstract rights of the episcopate. They were of opinion that the right to govern his clergy conveyed to the bishop by his letters patent had no force in the colony, because the date of those letters patent was subsequent to the



grant of a popular constitution to the Cape, by which all power in the Crown to establish ecclesiastical law there, if it ever existed, was virtually abrogated. But they, or at least the majority, were convinced by the concluding argument of the bishop, grounded as it is on one of those poetic fictions so welcome to the British lawyer, that the Rev. Mr. Long had in truth given the bishop full ecclesiastical jurisdiction over himself by 'consent.' That is to say, that because Mr. Long had taken the oath of canonical obedience to his bishop, and accepted an appointment to a cure 'under a deed which expressly contemplates 'as one means of avoidance the removal of the incumbent for 'any lawful cause,' therefore he had, by consent, introduced into the colony, as against himself, a large portion of Burns' Ecclesiastical Law. Upon this singular mode of reasoning, Mr. Long was held to have disobeyed the lawful orders of his bishop, which he, personally, had contracted to obey, although it was acknowledged by the Colonial Court that the bishop derived from his letters patent no power to issue such orders: and judgment went in the bishop's favour accordingly.

Mr. Long appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. And here, as constantly happens on appeals, the general questions having been well 'ventilated' as the lawyers phrase it, and disposed of, in the proceedings before the Court below, the really weak special point in the bishop's case, which had previously been rather overlaid in the wider controversy, came prominently forward. Admitting every other point decided in favour of the bishop, was his order to attend a synod of mixed clergy and laity (or to give notice thereof) a 'lawful' order? Mr. Long has submitted (by implication) to be deprived of his cure 'for any cause which (having regard to any 'difference which may arise from the circumstances of the 'colony) would authorise the deprivation of a clergyman by his 'bishop in England.' Was refusal to attend or give notice of a mixed synod such a cause? Obviously not. When the case came to be thus sifted, the bishop had really no ground whatever to stand on. No bishop in England could convoke such a synod, much less punish a clergyman for refusing to attend it. Neither, then, could the bishop of Cape Town. Assuming either of his main positions in his favour—assuming that his letters patent did give him the power of an English bishop—assuming that Mr. Long had consented to be subject to the powers of an English bishop,—this was an order transcending the powers of an English bishop, and Mr. Long was therefore justified in his resistance.

This, we say, was the point really at issue before the Judicial

Committee. The Court, however (possibly from a sense of the importance of the subject) went farther than the issue in Mr. Long's case absolutely required. They recited the conclusion of the Court below, that under the circumstances of the case the Bishop possessed no jurisdiction, ecclesiastical or civil, by virtue of his letters patent: and declared that in this conclusion they agreed. How far this strong declaration of opinion may be ultimately regarded as conclusive, time will show; but it derives much additional force from the eminence of the names attached to the judgment in question. Lord Kingsdown, Dr. Lushington, and Sir John Coleridge, who heard the case and concurred in the judgment, are beyond doubt the three judges best qualified to decide such a question in its relations to equity, to the law of the Church, and to the common law. The result is the reinstatement of Mr. Long in his cure: a result against which it appears the Bishop protests as an invasion of his spiritual rights. For in the singularly ill-judged paper which Dr. Gray has addressed to the churchwardens of St. Peter's, Mowbray, since the judgment of the Privy Council reached the Cape of Good Hope, he treats the case throughout as if it were an appeal from his ecclesiastical jurisdiction to the Queen's Council, whereas the judgment under review was the judgment of the Supreme Court—a purely civil tribunal—and the question really was whether the Bishop had any authority in dealing with his clergy to override the law of the land. It is important that it should be understood by such bishops as Dr. Gray, that they have no authority whatever but what the law gives them, and that the appellate jurisdiction of the Queen, which condemned him, was not ecclesiastical, but simply a review of the decision of a colonial Civil Court, to which as a resident at the Cape of Good Hope he was subject.

Such appear to be the legal disabilities, or difficulties, which at present impede the free action of the Church of England in the greater part of the dominions of the Crown. We have no wish to exaggerate them. If that Church has real vitality—if she possesses those qualities of the higher order which fit her to go forth conquering and to conquer—it is not by the fetters of mere chicanery that her triumphant progress will be impeded. But regarded from a lower point of view, the perplexity is considerable, and the way to escape from it not easily to be conjectured. If, indeed, the doctrine of consent, on which the Supreme Court of the Cape relied, and which the Judicial Committee regarded with no disfavour, may be considered as established, it would appear at first sight that the most pressing

part of the difficulty was overcome. If the colonial clergy, by merely taking the oath of canonical obedience to a bishop, have in fact subjected themselves to the entire body of ecclesiastical law, then it can no longer be said that the condition of the Church is one of anarchy. The bishop must then be taken to be vested with episcopal authority in spiritual matters, to which authority all the clergy who acknowledge obedience to him are canonically bound to submit, as long as such authority is lawfully exercised. But this definition of his powers evidently leaves a wide margin for discussion, and for the ultimate intervention of the Civil Courts; and every one knows, in practice, how impossible it is to rest so enormous a superstructure on so narrow a basis. The attempt would only produce more litigation than it would extinguish. And, even if this were otherwise, the establishment of ecclesiastical law is not what is wanted, but the power to form a government and a legislature which shall suit themselves to the altered wants of our times. This, it seems, can hardly be done except by calling in the aid of the law in the shape of some enactment, either colonial or parliamentary. It may be the due Nemesis for past centuries of oppression, but we confess there is to us something of humiliation in the spectacle now too often witnessed of whole communities of our brethren, members of the Church of England in the colonies, vainly besieging the doors of local legislatures, composed of men of other persuasions, and either indifferent or actuated by the lingering spirit of ancient hostility, not to ask for exclusive rights or privileges, but merely for power to govern themselves. And even if this road to justice were less obstructed, it behoves us as churchmen to have our eyes open to another danger. If the Church of England, in every colony, is to have her synodical government constituted according to the will of the legislature of that colony, uniformity of government will be difficult to maintain, and yet on this uniformity of doctrine and discipline will be found mainly to depend. Far better would it be for the Church—far better, in truth, for all parties concerned—if Parliament would do what it was invited to do in 1854, and pass, once for all, an organic law, enabling the Anglicans of every colony to frame for themselves the polity under which their church is to subsist. Whether the governing body so to be constituted should, or should not, have power to alter the fundamental laws of our Church as established by the Act of Uniformity—should have power, in other words, to break off communion with the Church at home if it pleased—is a serious question, on which we will not now enter. Not the slightest encroachment on the independence

of the colonial legislatures need be effected by such enactment, for it should be carefully provided that every such legislature should have the amplest power to alter, or, if necessary, to repeal, the enactment itself. No one wishes to force the consent of those local legislatures. All that is desired is, to set the machine in motion. But we fear that all such suggestions are in truth unavailing. The broad maxim, that Parliament is not to legislate for the colonies, will override all exceptional projects, however reasonable in themselves. It will override them, partly through a righteous deference to constitutional principles, much more because no British Government, constituted as governments now are, will dare to confront possible enmities for the sake of so remote and unpractical an interest as that of ecclesiastical administration. Meanwhile the episcopal authorities can but struggle on to the best of their ability, substituting the machinery of persuasion and consent for that of established jurisdiction. And if it is abundantly necessary that they should remember how unfitting arrogant pretensions or rash attempts to extend their sphere of action are in the case of functionaries so slenderly armed with power as themselves, much more should their subordinates be on their guard against allowing the spirit of opposition, or the pride of independence, or self-will in things indifferent, to set them in hostility to rulers who so peculiarly stand in need of affectionate support and encouragement.



## I N D E X.

## A

*Antiquity of Man*, 254. See *Lyell*.

*Architecture, Modern Styles of*, 71—Mr. Fergusson's history, 71.

*Austin*, John, his *Lectures on Jurisprudence*, reviewed, 439.

## B

*Blanc*, M. L., *Histoire de la Révolution Française*, reviewed, 101.

*Bolingbroke*, Lord, Life of, 404—his first session, 408—Harley and St. John, 412—Marlborough, 414—Swift's writings, 418—negotiations with France, 418—mission to Paris, 423—peace of Utrecht, 424—Bolingbroke and Oxford, 424—death of the Queen, 427—Bolingbroke attainted, 430—compositions in exile, 431—Pope's letters, 433—Bolingbroke's 'Patriot King,' 435.

## C

*Chinchona*, Cultivation of, in India, 507—Peruvian bark, 509—vegetable alkaloids, 511—Dr. Royle, 513—Mr. Markham's mission, 514—Mr. Spruce's collection, 515—Mr. McIvor's plantation at Dodabetta, 517—Mr. Howard's Report, 519—cultivation in Ceylon, 520—cotton of Peru, 521.

*Claverhouse, Memorials of*, 1—Sharpe's, Mr., 3—Claverhouse's first campaign, 8—letters to the Duke of Queensberry, 11—doings in 1679, 11—Scotland in 1684, 14—John Brown, 15—Wigton martyrs, 17—Mr. Napier's opinion, 20—evidence against him, 26—history of Claverhouse, 34—Napier's literary merits, 38.

*Coles*, Capt., his Iron-clad sea-going Shield Ships, reviewed, 166.

## D

*Druids and Bards*, 40—Druidical hierarchy, 45—Higgins' speculations, 48—Ogham Alphabet, 50—Druidic contact with primitive Christianity, 53—Scandinavian Sagas, 55—Stonehenge, 58—Welsh bards, 62—Gildas, 64—'Brut y Tywysogion,' 69.

## E

*Episcopate, Colonial*, the, 552—question of Episcopacy, 553—functional and administrative purposes of bishops, 556—missionary bishoprics, 558—endowment of colonial bishoprics, 561—position of the Church of England in the colonies, 565—objections to our colonial episcopate, 567—theory of colonial government, 574—government of the colonial church, 576—voluntary organisation, 577—synodical government, 581—legal status of the church in the colonies, 582—Bishop of Cape Town and Mr. Long, 582.

## F

*Fergusson*, James, his *Modern Styles of Architecture*, reviewed, 71—renaissance, 72—new Houses of Parliament, 73—Gothic and classical ornamentation, 74—northern architecture, 78—renais-

- sance, its tendency, 81—St. Peter's, 84—St. Paul's, 85—domical churches, 87—classical revival, 89—Gothic revival, 93—Pugin and Scott, 95—modern Gothic, 98—Italian style, 100.
- Francisque-Michel*, M., *Les Écossais en France*, &c., reviewed, 230.
- French Revolution*, the, 101—Louis Blanc's *History*, 104—massacres of September, 112—Danton, the Commune and the Sections, 114—Abbé Sicard, 117—Robe-pierre, 120—execution of Louis XVI., 121—death of Robespierre, 124—the Dauphin, 128—death of Desault, 131—Edgworth's '*Dernières Heures de Louis XVI.*,' 135.

## G

- Grant*, Capt. A., his *Ethnological Papers* reviewed, 207.
- Gregorovius*, F., his *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter*, 342—capture of Rome by Alaric, 346—Genseric, 348—Theodoric, 350—Belisarius and Narses, 351—Totila, 353—plague of 590, 354—Gregory the Great, 354—Christian churches, 355—ancient temples, 356—ecclesiastical character of Rome, 364—the Saracens, 365—'the Leonine City,' 367—Robert Guiscard, 369—Brancaleone, 373.

## H

- Hawkins*, Rev. E., his *Colonial Bishoprics*, reviewed, 552.
- Higgins*, Godfrey, his *Celtic Druids*, reviewed, 40.
- Howard*, J. E., his *Report on the Bark and Leaves of Cinchona Succiruba*, grown in India. reviewed, 507.

## J

- James*, Col. Sir H., his *Extension of the Triangulation of the Ordnance Survey into France and Belgium*, reviewed, 378.
- Jurisprudence*, 439—Mr. Austin's '*Province of Jurisprudence*,' 441—Mr. Maine's speculations, 442—Roman law, 445—Mr. Austin's '*Lectures*,' 448—moral law, 450—rights, duties, and obligations, 452—written and unwritten law, 456—Law of Nature, 459—judiciary law, 463—Codification, 467—Law of Persons and Law of Things, 471—Rights, Wrongs, and Remedies, 475.

## K

- Kinglake*, Mr., note on his *Invasion of the Crimea*, 303.

## L

- Lang*, Dr. J. D., his *Queensland*, reviewed, 305.
- Lewis*, Sir G. C., his *best Form of Government*, reviewed, 138—his *Dialogue*, 138—monarchies and republics, 139—the United States, 145—career of Sir G. Lewis, 152—speeches, 160—literary labours, 160.
- Lyell*, Sir C., his *Geological Evidences of the Antiquity of Man*, 254—newer formations, 258—fossil human remains, 259—Abbeville fossils, 261—post-tertiary beds, 265—post-pliocene, 266—Sir Charles Lyell and Mr. Prestwich, 268—relics in the Somme, 269—fossil human jaw at Moulin Quignon, 271—Elie de Beaumont's view, 275—bone-cave deposits, 276—Brixham, 277—skulls of Engis and Neanderthal, and Aurignac, 280—M. Lartet's '*recent*'

period, 289—age of the human race, 295—quaternary and recent deposits, 296—geological uniformity, 298—drift of south-east of England, 299—glacial agencies, 301.

## M

- Macknight*, Thomas, his *Life of Lord Bolingbroke*, reviewed, 404.  
*Markham*, C. R., his *Indigenous Cotton Plant of Peru, &c.*, 507.  
*Murkham*, C. R., his *Travels in Peru and India*, reviewed, 507.  
*McIvor*, W. G., his *Two Letters to Mr. Sim*, reviewed, 507.  
*McIvor*, W. G., his *Propagation of the Medical Chinchonas*, 507.  
*Milne-Edwards*, M., his *Note sur l'Authenticité de la Découverte d'une Machoire humaine et de Haches de Silex dans le Terrain diluvien de Moulin Quignon*, reviewed, 254.  
*Mortimer-Ternaux*, *Histoire de la Terreur, 1792-4*, reviewed, 104.  
*Mudge*, Capt. W., and Dalby, Isaac, their *Trigonometrical Survey of England and Wales from 1784 to 1794*, reviewed, 378.  
*Murchison*, Sir R. L., his *Anniversary Address*, reviewed, 207.

## N

- Napier*, Mark, his *Memorials of Graham of Claverhouse*, reviewed, 1—his *Wigton Martyrs proved to be Myths*, reviewed, 1.  
*Naries* of France and England, 166—iron-clad ships, 169—the 'Gloire,' 169—relative strength of England and France, 170—modern artillery, 177—Admiral Hugon, 178—our Admiralty system, 178—merchant service, 180—the 'Gloire' and the 'Warrior,' 184—Armstrong guns, 191—Whitworth's, 192—artillery and armour-plates, 194—floating batteries, 197—Capt. Coles' shield, 197—the 'Royal Sovereign,' 199—American iron-clads, 203.  
*Nile, the Sources of*, 207—expedition of Speke and Grant, 211—Kuzeh, 213—Wanyamesi, 213—Wahuma kings, 215—Uganda, 216—Haragwé, 217—Lake Tanganyika, 217—sources of the Congo, 218—water supply of Central Africa, 220—Negroland, 222—Uganda, 223—M'tése, 224—Unyoro, 227—Gondakoro, 228.

## P

- Papers on the Royal Guard of Scottish Archers in France*, 230.  
*Papiers d'État relatifs à l'Histoire de l'Écosse au 16<sup>me</sup> Siècle*, 230.  
*Pertus*, M. Boucher de, his *Antiquités Celtiques et Antédiluviennes*, reviewed, 254; his *Machoire humaine découverte à Abbeville dans un terrain non remanié*, reviewed, 254.  
*Phillimore*, J. G., his *Reign of George III.*, reviewed, 523—our 'form of government,' 525—history from the Conquest to the Revolution, 527—main events of the reigns of George I. and II., 531—Stanhope and Walpole, 532—sketch of reign of George III., 533—king-craft of George III., 534—Wilkes, 538—Ireland and India, 539.  
*Pratt*, Rev. J. B., his *Druids illustrated*, reviewed, 40.  
*Prestwich*, J., his *Occurrence of Flint Implements, &c.*, reviewed, 254.  
*Privy Council*, Judgment of the, on Appeal of Rev. W. Long v. the Bishop of Cape Town, reviewed, 552.  
*Pugh's Queensland Almanac, &c.*, reviewed, 305.



## Q

*Queensland*, 305—Dr. Lang's services, 306—Clarence and Richmond Rivers, 308—extent of Queensland, 309—'Capricornia,' 310—Australian transportation, 312—natural features of Queensland, 314—its sea-board, 314—Brisbane, 316—Great Coast Range, 317—rivers, 317—Darling Downs, 318—crops, 319—Australian squatters, 320—sheep-farmers, 323—discovery of gold, 325—Land Bills, 326—late explorations, 331—Sturt's Stony Desert, 331—sugar and tobacco, 334—indigo, 337—cotton, 338.

## R

*Raymond*, Xavier, *Marines de la France et de l'Angleterre*, reviewed, 166.

*Royal Academy*, the, 483—Mr. Sandby's History, 483—constitution of the Royal Academy, 487—its services, 489—state of the schools, 489—the Exhibition, 494—Report of Royal Commission, 495—Academicians and Associates, 496—Mr. Cope's evidence, 499—honorary members, 500—connexion between the arts and sciences, 502—lectures, 503—the Academy and the National Gallery, 506.

## S

*Sandby*, W., his *History of the Royal Academy*, reviewed, 483.

*Scots in France—French in Scotland*, 230—M. Michel's work, 230—Scottish mercenaries, 234—Scotch colonies, 238—continental trade, 239—Scotch educational establishments, 243—Scotchmen absorbed by France, 248—French ecclesiastical preferments, 249.

*Speke*, Captain, his *Memoirs* communicated to the Royal Geographical Society, reviewed, 207.

*Statistical Register of Queensland* for 1860–62, reviewed, 305.

*Survey, Cadastral, of Great Britain*, 378—General Roy, 380—triangulation of Great Britain, 382—survey of Ireland, 389—Colonel Colby, 389—the scale, 390—report of the royal commission, 392—errors of the opponents of a large scale, 394—25-inch scale, 396—Photozincography, 396—Sir Henry James's invention, 397—plates electrotyped, 397—the commissioners' maps, 398.

## T

*Tara: a Mahratta Tale*, 542—its interest, 543—native aspect of India, 544—empire of Sivajee, 545—chief personages of the tale, 545—the heroine, 545—Afzool Khan and Sivajee, 546.

## W

*Wight*, Dr., his *Introduction of the Cotton Plants of the Peruvian Coast Valleys into the Madras Presidency*, reviewed, 507.

*Williams ab Ithel*, Rev. J., his *Brut y Tywysogion*, reviewed, 20.

*Wilson*, Dr., his *Prehistoric Man*, reviewed, 254.

THE END OF VOL. CXVIII.









